

[Price 6d. each.]

Islamic Review

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING,

Edited by { KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.
MAULVIE SADR-UD-DIN, B.A., B.T.

VOL. II.] NOVEMBER 1914. [No. 10.

Contents.

PAGE

The Present War: The Spirit of Christianity	-	-	-	473
Why does not Christianity Speak with Authority to Christendom To-day				477
Betterment through Brotherhood. By ERIC HAMMOND	-	-	-	479
At the Feet of Muhammad. By DR. AMEEN NEVILLE J. WHYMANT	-	-	-	482
The Philosophy of War in Comparative Religion. By DR. AMEEN NEVILLE J. WHYMANT	-	-	-	482
Islam: Principles of Islam. By SAYYID MOHAMMAD	-	-	-	485
Islam—a Perfect Brotherhood. By KHALID SHELDRAKE	-	-	-	488
What is Dogma? By LORD HEADLEY	-	-	-	490
Missionary Propaganda. By A WESTERNER	-	-	-	495
A Spirit in Prison. By AMEENA	-	-	-	499
The Outcast. By AMEENA	-	-	-	499
The True Meaning of Some of the Things of Christ	-	-	-	500
The Ethics of the War. By J. PARKINSON	-	-	-	505
Islam. By MOBARIKAH ALICE WELCH	-	-	-	511
The Quran as a Miracle. By MAULVI MOHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B.	-	-	-	511
Even Poisoning of Mohammad Elicited but Forgiveness	-	-	-	515
Divorce,—East and West. By KHALID SHELDRAKE	-	-	-	518
Does Christ Endorse the Christian Meaning of Faith? By RALPH SHIRLEY	-	-	-	521
Le Muslima Grava Prego (<i>Esperanto</i>)	-	-	-	522
Arabic	-	-	-	525

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance; and in India Rs. 7.

*Single copies to be obtained from The Mosque, Woking,
and in India from Azeezmanzal, Lahore.*

London:

J. S. PHILLIPS, 99 SHOE LANE, E.C.

۷۱۶
اسلامک ریویو کی قیمت میں اضافہ

موجودہ ضرورتوں کے مقابل رسالہ کا حجم کافی نہ تھا اسلئے سر دست رسالہ
قریباً دو گنا کر دیا ہے۔ آئندہ مکن سے بہت جلد حجم اور بڑے یا رسالہ مینہ میں
دوبارہ جو جاوے قیمت سال روان اسوقت بعض سے بحاب پانچ روپیہ وصول
مہور ہوئی ہے۔ اور میں نے قیمت رسالہ سات روپیہ کر دی ہے۔ اسلئے میں ان احباب
کے خدمت میں عرض کرتا ہوں کہ یہ رسالہ تا جراتہ اصول پر نہیں چلایا گیا۔
غرض یہ ہے کہ اسکی قیمت سی کا پانچ سو مفت غیر مسلم دنیا میں تقسیم ہوں۔ اسلئے
رسالہ کی اس غرض کو مد نظر رکھ کر اگر یہ احباب خود بخود زائد قیمت بجے یا لاہور
میں پیچیدین تو ان کی غنائت والہ میں یہ امر ہی خدا پر چھوڑتا ہوں۔ یہ رسالے
تو یہی مافی غرض ہے کہ اسلام کا درخشندہ چہرہ نہ صرف غیر اسلامی دنیا پر چمکنے
لگتا ہے بلکہ خود انگریزی خوان مسلم طبقہ اسلام کا عاشق ہوتا جاتا ہے
خود بخود قلوب میں تبلیغ دین کا خاص جوش پیدا ہو رہا ہے۔ کل اسلامی دنیا
از سر نو اصلی اسلامی زندگی کی طرف آرہی ہے۔ جن خریداران رسالہ کا سال
کسی درمیانی ماہ سے شروع ہوا ہے وہ بھی اگر گذشتہ سن کا نمبر منگوائے بحاب
شروع سال سے درست کر دین تو رسالہ سے بہت سا بوجہ بکھا ہو جاوے گا۔
لیونکہ متفرق بحاب علی کی زیادتی کو چاہتے ہیں اور یہاں گنجائش نہیں۔
پیری غرض تو یہ ہے کہ حنفیہ مکن ہو یہ رسالہ مفت تقسیم ہو۔ سو اس میں
جو میرا مانہ بٹائے وہ عند اللہ اپنے آپ کو ماحور سمجھے۔

خواجہ کمال الدین Khwaja Kamaluddin

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

To meet the complaints of such of our readers and subscribers as may not happen to receive particular numbers of the *Islamic Review*, the undersigned requests them to inform him at once.

SH. NOORAHMAD, Manager.
The Mosque, Woking, England.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

NOVEMBER 1914.

[No. 10.

THE PRESENT WAR.

III.—THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY.

WILL those Evangelising missionaries of the world in the name of Jesus Christ accept this butchery and vandalism of the day as one of the blessings which their religion has conferred on humanity? Have they not, till now, been in the habit of ascribing everything in Europe to their Creed? With their weak polemics and lame theology they were wise enough to avoid joining issue with Islam on rational grounds, but they never failed to father upon Christianity everything that has been achieved in the name of Civilisation. Though one fails to read in the Bible anything that could lead to present culture and advancement, they are never tired of coupling Christianity with Civilisation. They had their own special kind of logic: "Europe is Christian" and "Europe is civilised" were their major and minor premises, and they jumped at once to the conclusion (though at the expense of all the rules of syllogism) that Christianity was Civilisation.

We, however, are anxiously waiting to hear what the logicians of this class have to say as to the present situation in Europe, which clearly is the creation of modern Civilisation. If modern Civilisation be the fruit of their religion, as so often claimed by Christian missionaries, they should not now shirk the logical conclusion which makes it responsible for what we

now find in Europe. Let them be consistent, and we think history, at least in this case, will not fail to support them. Christianity was never meek and mild, but just the reverse—always knee-deep in blood. If ignorance and an uncultivated state of mind could be responsible for mediæval Christian atrocities, this plea cannot now be urged in these days of refinement and learning. "I have come to send a sword and fire into the world" were prophetic words of the Lord, and could not fail to receive their fulfilment. The sword was sent into the heart of humanity in days gone by, and the fire had to come now. It may be said, however, that the teachings of the Lord Jesus did not give countenance to this interpretation, as we find in the Bible. This is plausible, but unless everything is to be decided by reference to the Biblical text, the argument is absolutely false. If the words of Christ have to decide the point at issue, then modern culture and advancement will find something pernicious in their growth, rather than a support, in the words of Jesus. But if no heed is to be given to his words as recorded in the Bible—you cannot claim one thing and disown the other.

But there is another aspect of the question which requires consideration: Can a religion such as preached by Jesus be of any use to humanity? That it has been an utter failure is an admitted fact of history. That "cheek morality and slavish forgiveness" has never been the order of the day: it is rather an insult to the Divine Providence who has endowed us with various stern passions, which, when properly balanced, become high morality. Any teaching which demands the elimination of natural cravings will prove to be a failure in the long run. We do possess the instinct of anger, and the spirit of vengeance, and various other desires, which can be regulated and balanced, but cannot be thwarted. Jesus adopted the latter course, and met with no success. If Christianity means the observance of the injunctions of her Teacher, this religion met with a fatal blow when it emerged from among "slaves and serfs," but if it is a criminal thing, it has flourished, and will flourish for ever.

And what about that "spirit of Christianity" which the over-philanthropy of the West wants to create in the East? If the tree could be known by its fruits, the East may be better without it. Those who preach homilies to others often stand more in need of them themselves. Only a short time ago, in June last, when speaking to the members of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, Lord Sydenham, the late Governor of Bombay, said that "he went to India with no great prepossession in favour of Missionary work, but after five-and-a-half years of careful study of the tendencies and conditions of modern India, he had come to the conclusion that Missionary effort was playing a far greater part than was realised in the raising OF HIGH IDEALS AMONG THE PEOPLE. . . . The problem of India became more complex every year. The work the British people had done

there was quite marvellous ; but it was not nearly finished, and perhaps the most difficult part still remained to be accomplished. It was only under British rule that there could be the least hope of building up, out of the very elements of India, a nation capable of standing alone. He must doubt whether that could be accomplished *until the spirit of Christianity had spread throughout the length and breadth of the East.*"

With all due deference to this high authority on Indian matters, we doubt very much whether there was anything definite in the mind of Lord Sydenham when he spoke what we have *italicised* in the above. To speak words with no significance in the mind of the speaker has become an ornamental part of the oratory of to-day. Men articulate words which they hardly mean. There are certain words and phrases in currency which it would seem must be used from the pulpit and the platform, though the mind of the speaker is often blank as to what he conveys to his audience. "SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY" is one of such pet but meaningless expressions in common parlance. Try to read it in the light of events in Christendom, and the expression appears to be divested absolutely of all that is claimed for it from the pulpit. We wish that Lord Sydenham or some other high dignitary in Church or State could enlighten the heathen world as to its real significance. If it means the spirit that permeates the teaching of the gentle Nazarene, it has never received practical translation in the actions of his followers since the advent of his disciples in the West. To be charitable to our enemies is, perhaps, the chief point of Christ's Sermon : but where it received even a semblance of practical adoption is itself a mystery, like other mysteries of the religion throughout the West. Since the conversion of Constantine the record of Christianity has been anything but clean in this respect. Blood has never been more freely shed in the name of Religion than we find it in Christendom. The Christian Church has been chiefly responsible for this pious but sanguinary militarism. Do not these belligerent nations profess Christianity? Is Europe exhibiting the spirit of Christ? Was this the high ideal Christian Europe was hastening to? In this war the conduct of some is absolutely justified, as is the case of the British nation, but it is so on principles other than those of Christian teaching. To follow Christ at this junction would be a suicidal act. But what about those who have caused this most heinous conflagration? Were they not baptised in the name of Christ? Could not the spirit of Christianity act as an efficacious check against this brutality, and destroy the canine spirit in man? It is all very well for the Bishop of Sheffield to say : "*The present state of Christianity is a disgrace and an absolute contradiction to the teaching of Christ. It is dead against the Bible from the beginning to the end.*"* The right rev. gentleman has spoken the

* The Edinburgh Evening News, June 23, 1914.

truth pure and simple. But such has been the state of Christianity at every stage of its growth after the first three centuries. If Christianity means the observance of what was taught by the Lord Jesus, it is not only its present state which is "so disgraceful"; it has been the same century after century. If religion only means belief in some dogma, and if it need not create any responsibility of action, the religion of the Christian Church may boast of its success; but if the success of the teachings of a religion consist in its being respected through the actions of its adherents, Christianity was never the religion of those who identified themselves with it. Jesus no doubt preached an idealism, but from a practical point of view it remained always beyond human perception. It may be *par excellence* to an imaginative mind, but it has never appealed to the minds of practical men. Any teachings which destroy human craving of any kind, and smother passions and desires inherent in our nature, instead of regulating or balancing them, can do no good to humanity, and are sure to die of themselves.

THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY AND HER MISSIONARIES.

It is often said that the missionaries of Christ are the best specimens of his teaching: they are meek and gentle and patient in their deportment. But whether this is owing to the position they fulfil, or the influence of the religion itself, remains to be decided. The world has to thank its lucky star to find clerical influence on the wane in matters of State, otherwise the Mediæval Church's activities might not have come to an end. But there is another way of deciding this question. The spirit of Christianity exhibits various aspects, applicable to different walks of life: the preachers of this religion have to follow a different code from that prescribed by Jesus himself. These are the present-day evangelists of the world, and the record of the old Evangelist contains the following words of Jesus Christ, spoken by him to his disciples when he sent them out to preach among the tribes of Israel:—

"Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves" (Matt. x. 9, 10). "Take no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself" (Matt. vi. 34).

This is the true Christian spirit, which should exhibit itself in the actions of the missionaries. But has the Christian missionary ever acted upon these ordinances of the Master? Is he not ever clammering for funds? The missionary of the day is of quite a different type. "Can our pay be raised?" to use the words of Mr. Barry, is the only subject one hears in missionary conversations.

WHY DOES NOT CHRISTIANITY SPEAK WITH AUTHORITY TO CHRISTEN- DOM TO-DAY?

ARCHDEACON LILLEY SAYS THAT THE CHRISTIAN
CONSCIENCE IS NOT AT UNITY WITH ITSELF IN
ANY COUNTRY, IN ANY CHURCH OF CHRISTENDOM
AT THIS HOUR.

Archdeacon A. L. Lilley has a suggestive article in "The Inquirer" which raises a far greater problem even than the war which suggests it:—

"Christianity has nothing to say to the contending nations which have all alike issued from her womb. Christianity cannot speak with authority to Christendom. The Catholic religion has no catholic message.

"In the Papal Conclave itself, Rumour announces with a probability which is not always hers, fierce and heated division declares itself.

"Cardinal Mercier protests on behalf of an outraged and tortured nation. He is supported by the French and English Cardinals. The Austrians and Germans vigorously impugn this 'undue interference of politics in the highest spiritual functions of the Church.' And an American and an Italian, apparently, endeavour to keep the peace—*i.e.*, to refrain from taking sides, as it is the duty and the privilege of neutrals to do.

APPALLING TRAGEDY.

"That is indeed high comedy. But it is also terrible, appalling tragedy. *Infallible authority in the sphere of morals, being in temporary commission, when challenged by the most momentous of moral issues, goes just one better than Janus.* It presents three faces to the world and utters itself through them all, passionately proclaiming its yes *and* no, *and* with the smooth politeness of the neutral deprecating both. And while religious authority is in this spirit preparing its new infallible voice, prayers go up from the Catholic altar, which we know, wherever it may be set up is one, for the triumph of each of two contending causes and for the confusion of its opposite.

FICTION OF CATHOLIC UNITY.

"The fiction of Catholic unity is self-refuted, self-dispelled. Faith and morals are indissolubly bound together, as Catholic instinct has always felt and Catholic dogma has definitely asserted. And what is the meaning of unity of faith if it cannot translate itself, I will not say into a definitely righteous action, but into a definite conviction as to what action, in a given crisis of decision, is righteous?

"The fiery furnace through which human history is passing will burn up every shred of the pious pretence in which it has delighted to clothe itself. There will be left nothing but the facts, or rather the naked fact, of history; *and that fact is that morality, the very knowledge of what morality is, is not an original and secure possession, but the dubious conquest of a truceless struggle.*

"The nerve of that struggle has been knit by the spirit of Christ. That is our faith, and that faith itself grows out of the growing experience that no other spirit gives us such satisfying success in the predestined conflict. Only the knowledge of fuller right wrung from the fierce wrestle with circumstance in what we now see of the Spirit of Christ can lead us into a deeper knowledge of what that Spirit is for us.

"The content of faith itself is not fixed, but progressive. Like the content of righteousness, it is not a fixed sum to be jealously preserved, but the growing result of a courageous venture in the world of action. If we are to bury our talent in the earth, let it be in the fertile earth of opportunity, where it can strike root and grow.

THE PLAINEST FACT.

"Our idealism has been weak and futile, because it has been blind to the plainest fact. We have talked sentimentally about the unity of Christendom. We have made an appeal against the horrors of war, in favour of international arbitration and universal peace, to the universal Christian conscience. But the fact is, and always has been, that *the universal Christian conscience does not exist.*

"The Christian conscience of Eastern Europe is not the Christian conscience of the West. The Christian conscience of Western Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not what it is to-day. *The Christian conscience is not at unity with itself in any country, in any Church, of Christendom at this present hour.*

"We may not clearly see or acutely feel the division in times of quiet, while life moves in its customary grooves. It is when the earthquakes of history shake every established fact to its foundations that we discover the rents which have been there all the time, now enlarged and fearfully gaping.

CLAIM OF THE CHRIST-SPIRIT.

"*There ought to be no doubt, in such a world-crisis, as to what the claim of the Christ-spirit is.* But we are suddenly brought up against the fact that Christianity in its most highly organised and authoritative form has no word to say to which all its own children will harken.

"It is well that this fiction as to the nature of authority in the sphere of morals should be exploded once again. For the truth is that *the Christ-spirit makes its ultimately effectual appeal to the individual conscience, that it calls upon the individual*

conscience to make the venture in action through which alone its decrees can be interpreted and put to the proof.

"Christian morality may have, and undoubtedly has, its clear standards of right. But in the crises of circumstance which demand the translation of those standards into concrete action, the decision as to what the appropriate action is to be rests with the individual conscience and with the various corporate units of conscience in which individual consciences tend to concentrate.

"To-day those units prove to be nations, not Churches."

PROFESSOR EUCKEN AND CHRISTIANITY.

Professor Rudolf Eucken, of Jena, in his book which we recently reviewed, "Can We Still Be Christians?" says:—

"We saw that the supremacy of the spiritual life which Christianity supports with so much emphasis can and must maintain itself even on modern ground. We saw that the spiritual activity of man can never depend upon the capacity of the isolated individual, but that obstacles without and divisions within can be overcome only through the living presence of a life which draws from the whole, a life which does not merely raise what is given to a higher power, but transforms its very essence.

"We convinced ourselves of the permanent significance of the distinctively Christian morality; we convinced ourselves also that the moral idea should rightfully claim to direct the whole life. The concrete fact which gave stability and orientation to life had to be shifted further back, but a central concrete actuality of a spiritual kind was found to be absolutely indispensable, and with it was disclosed also the possibility of retaining, within religion, the permanent significance of the individual personality.

"Lastly, the formation of an independent community under the banner of religion was shown to be indispensable. The truth itself is not shaken, because in its development among us men it has to pass through different phases. In the light of such reflections we believe ourselves justified in returning a confident yes to the question: 'Can we still be Christians?'"

—*Public Opinion.*

BETTERMENT THROUGH BROTHERHOOD.

THE strong, sonorous note struck by Lord Headley in "Comrades in Arms" (*Islamic Review*, October 1914), and evidently appreciated by the author of "The Present War," makes an appeal which must have an immediate and abiding effect on the minds of many readers. We are in very deed already "great gainers" through this scourge of one of the most "outrageously

unfair wars in the history of the world." No better or more fitting quotation in support of the beauty and efficacy of unity could be discovered than this: "Thus, out of the jangling clash of arms and falling buildings there is one note of sweetness which will echo for ever down the aisles of futurity—it is the note of brotherly love established between peoples who delight not in war, but, with true Islamic sincerity, in upholding the Right at any cost."

The glorification of war, as war, as a means of an endeavour to establish the un-divine doctrine that the strong must oppress and enfeeble the already weak, may be left to the pens and lips of those "philosophers" who have smugly sat at the feet of Bernhardt and his like. The war now raging is the battle-drum of the apostles of that philosophy. It is also its death-knell, for, by God's grace, this earth of His shall never again be subjected to such shameful and shameless degradation. Most happily, the very din of warfare has done much, and will do more, towards bringing nation and nation, man and man, together in a conscious sense of fraternal relationship. It has done much also, and will do more, towards a new birth, a revivification of the young men of our empire in the East and in the West alike. It will assure, it is already assuring, a closer comprehension, a completer understanding, by representatives of the finest manhood of each side of our imperial sphere. Britons have been labelled "aloof" and "reserved." They have been born to, and have cherished, an external coolness of bearing which has not infrequently belied their real cordiality of spirit. A love of sport on their part has led superficial onlookers to presume them averse to participation in serious affairs. Even when engaged upon matters of importance they dislike to discuss them in public—dislike to "talk shop." Hence, perhaps, an air of flippancy seems to surround them. They hold, too, that an exhibition of deep emotion is, so to speak, incorrect. Great joy, crushing sorrow must be concealed by quietude of conduct. Pain must be borne without loud-voiced lamentation. Trouble must be worded with a joke, alluded to with a smile.

May not a somewhat similar instinct, or range of instincts, be claimed as characteristic of some of the sons of Islam? They, too, bear themselves proudly among the vicissitudes to which flesh is heir. Their pride, it is true, manifests itself with dignity, with a princely disregard of the presence of pains and penalties. They, too, may appear "aloof," "reserved." There is, a part and parcel of their being, a happy assurance of certainty in the coming right of things. One cannot fail to remark an admirable poise in the manner of their movement, physical and mental. That poise, with perhaps natural difference, is not absent from the British people. The "feeling" is identical, though its aspect may vary. There is a profound similarity beneath an apparent contrariety of custom and of expression. Greater intimacy must

result in deeper knowledge. Man will learn, by acquaintance, to recognise and acknowledge likeness, and, out of that acknowledgment, appreciation is bound to obtain. A recent incident, slight in itself but pregnant with meaning, may serve as an illustration. The horse of a young Territorial slipped on the newly-watered roadway of Victoria Street and fell. Its rider, with delightful grace and dexterity, extricated himself from a dangerous position and stood erect, instantly as it seemed. His first care was for his frightened mount. The horse was soon soothed by a kindly word or two, by equally kindly patting, by an even more kindly kiss on its quivering nostril. Its limbs were closely but quickly inspected. Then, and not till then, did the thrown man attempt to examine himself as to the possibility of personal injury. Meanwhile his cigarette remained lighted, and, indeed, despite the caress, had not left his lips. Those few persons who had stopped to see if aid were wanted heard "all right" with gratification. The soldier, once again on horseback, moved nonchalantly away. The episode had closed, but left an ineffaceable memory. An example of British phlegm? True, but a reflection, also, of a feature in the best Muslim manner. May we not, without labouring the point too far, claim something in common each with each? One great distinction must, in fairness, be drawn between one and the other.

Religion and the open recognition of religion, not only enjoined but enjoyed, stands out as a notable factor among men of Islamic profession. With them the one God is felt to be ever near. Each step they take in the path of life is taken under the immediate hope of His care and guidance. So assured are they of His perpetual presence that prayer, abiding always in their hearts, is very readily responded to by their tongues. Their day divides itself into a sacred scheme and its divisions may never, with them, be carelessly passed by.

Englishmen, as a rule, have adopted another and different position. Religious they may be. They may hold to no denial of deity. They may believe in the Creator and the All-Father. They may even make profession of one or other of the Christian Churches; but outward manifestation is, usually, inconspicuous. In a word, it is "bad form" to give religion a front place in affairs. Rather, the Briton has robed himself in a garment of concealment wherever his deepest and sincerest emotions are concerned. So completely is this the case that a sort of suspicion is apt to surround a man who loudly asserts religious proclivities. That suspicion, and all the erring mental ways leading up—or rather down—to it, should be avoided as altogether evil. The beautiful and sustaining spiritual atmosphere common to Islam cannot fail, when better known and therefore better divined, to have gracious effect.

Thus, then, we may confidently anticipate betterment as resulting from comradeship in the field of strife itself. Good

will be born of apparent evil. The Lord of Life will evoke a fresh and vivid product of peace out of the conditions of quarrel and death.

ERIC HAMMOND.

AT THE FEET OF MUHAMMAD.

By Dr. AMEEN NEVILLE J. WHYMANT.

THE stars shine clear o'er the desert wide,
The moon smiles down in peace,
And the gossamer veil of eventide
Gives night from day release.
And on my ear fall words so fragrant and sweet,
At the feet of Muhammad East and West meet.

The Yogi and Swami, Rishi too,
Bow to Allah the One.
And Christian and Buddhist and Hindu
Unite when day is done
Together to pray and together repeat,
At the feet of Muhammad East and West meet.

While clearly the Mosque lamp is burning
Their voices whisper low,
In the tongue of Romance and Learning,
The truths that all men should know.
Then let us arise and the new message greet,
At the feet of Muhammad East and West meet.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WAR IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

By AMEEN NEVILLE J. WHYMANT, Ph.D., of Oxford.

EVERY phase of individual or national life which transcends the ordinary addresses an appeal to the philosophy of the age. From the primitive stage of man even till now there has been felt a need for justification—a comparison with a set standard for every act which in any way might affect another. This argument might be carried so far as to show that this very seeking for a standard of moral rectitude or degeneracy has evolved what we call Religion.

Also since the world began there has been prevalent in the mind of man the predominant query "Why"? True the

majority of people are content to accept things as they are, but some minds seem constituted for the especial purpose of seeking out the unseen, and probing into the hidden mysteries and dark problems of the hitherto unknown. And this, following the same logic as before, leads us to realise that here is the basis of philosophy and psychology.

Those of us whose academic interests and duties lead us into the paths of the unseen, and into the thickets and almost impenetrable forests of profound metaphysics, must needs follow the hard, deserted, winding road of mystical philosophy. But what of the vast procession that is neither able nor willing to follow this hidden and mysterious road? Where is their standard for the judgment of moral rectitude in daily life?

The seemingly impossible has happened. In the heyday of peace conferences, peace organisations, commercial prosperity and the much-vaunted rationalism of our civilisation, barbarism has run riot. The glorious deity called war had no sooner been unmasked to the whole world as the "great illusion" than the hydra-headed monster put forth its claws and drew into itself the whole of Europe, disorganised the world of commerce, held back the clock hands of progress, and plunged mankind into a state of speechless amazement. It was incomprehensible and unforeseen, and mankind was shaken from its composure and lethargy, and confronted with the problem "What think ye?"

The calm academical scholar is the first to act. Turning over the pages of history he seeks similar problems in bygone ages, learns from the past (the greatest teacher of the present) how he must act, how he must judge. But war with its horror and nakedness does not reach the cloister of the scholastic hermit. It chooses rather to stalk through city streets, up among garrets and attics, amongst mothers and daughters, wives and sons, leaving its mark of lurid red on the brain of each soul it visits. How shall there be a guide for these who walk not the high-road of philosophy, who hold not the key to the palace of mysticism, and who dwell, alas! too often, in the shade of impotence and the unreality of materialism? Have they a companion to walk side by side with them when the journey of life is hard? Have they a member to whom they can turn when problems too great for them are near? Have they a friend whose experience of war and its loathsomeness will hold them fast when they would fall? The cry of such souls is pitiful indeed; it rings with dull persistency on the brain unceasingly. And the cry is ever "*Al Furkan aakence! Al Furkan aakence!*" Where is this "illumination" to be found?

Can prophets give us "*Al Furkan*"? Assuredly not unless Allah wills. And who is a prophet except by the ordination of Him? Then which of the Prophets brings us this priceless gift from Allah? Does Moses? Moses has written in Ten Laws "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not." No gift is here. Abraham and David? Behold they bestow but world-gifts upon their

race. Jesus? Did he not say, when asked to battle for his people, that he came not to conquer? Is not his teaching an abhorrence of the sword, even in the age when the sword was triumphant, when *his* people (as they were called) were under the yoke of Rome by conquest? Did he not preach a doctrine of non-resistance at a time when for thousands of years non-resistance would mean subjugation? Truly no satisfaction is here. Zoroaster? Can a prophet of the mountains, fiery yet calm, ascetic and learned, teach us of war? Can he who was lost in the wonderful mysticism of Sufi philosophy in embryo teach us from a rose-garden concerning the groaning field of blood and slaughter? Nay, rather is he a teacher for those few who head the highroad of philosophy; but for the millions who writhe in the grip of war he has no message that they can understand. Can Buddha show us the way? Assuredly he, whose teachings puzzle even the academical mind, is as a professor addressing a wilderness of stones. Is there not one? Who is he that said "Behold, this is a plain teaching"?* Who said "Blessed be He who hath sent down Al Furkan (the illumination) on his servant, that to all creatures he may be a warner"? (Quran, Sura xxv., 1.) Is this the prophet who led an army against an oppressive and aggressive enemy? Indeed yes. Should not such a prophet teach us of the battlefield who himself was *in* it? Should he not be our guide in war, who had war forced upon him and carried it through successfully? Shall we not find in his teaching verses to help the weary heart disheartened by war?

On all hands at the present time we find an intense desire on the part of all leaders of thought to reconcile their teaching with the present crisis. As though, according to a preconceived scheme, bishop and priest, Baptist and Congregationalist, Wesleyan and Calvinist, Rationalist and Atheist begin to discourse on War and Faith. They attempt to make the two cars run on parallel rails, while some attempt to include both War and Faith in the same breath as diametrically opposed to each other. Endless discussions are conducted to the one effect that "I came out at the same door as in I went." Islam has been defined as the most democratic of religions. And which is the voice that calls loudest to-day? The voice of the people is crying, "Why is this?" The Eternal question of the Eternal multitude. And they are being told to go to sleep in the lethal-chamber of Blind Faith until the morning sun shall rise again; by which time it is hoped the battlefield will have been cleared of its ugly load, and memory shall have been dulled. Is the teaching of him who fought his battles with a small force against many and finally triumphed confined to the Mosque on one day in the week? No. Is the advice he gives "Close your eyes until what you wish returns again"? Most decidedly

* A book whose verses (signs) are made plain. (Quran, Sura xli., 2.)

no. In these days of scientific research and philosophical scholarship the searchlight of pragmatism and daily life is turned even on religion. Shall your faith quiver in the burning gleam? Will it shrivel up and disappear in the Light that proves all? Our belief needs revision until, with the "Book made plain," we can stand unashamed before the Omniscience.

The popularly-supposed originator of this international chaos is daily invoking and complimenting the One. Amongst the nations combined against him this causes much indignation and disgust. Many have written poems apostrophising the Kaiser in no uncertain terms for his thus claiming partnership with the Omnipotent One. And yet no cry is raised when a widely-known writer on Christian subjects turns his hand to the War Game and closes his poem in a similar strain :—

"When your comrades stand to the tyrant's blow
And England's call is God's."

Let us shake off the dust of narrowness from our minds. Let us clear our souls of mean perjury and slander. For such it is. Has the Allah of the world since the beginning ever been a proprietary God? Has He ever had a "chosen people"? What barbarous notions are these to exist, aye! and flourish too, in a civilisation so vaunted as ours. Islam teaches the world-truth that Allah created and preserves *all* creatures. How primitive it is to imagine that one race alone has favour with Him and that the others must exist under His disfavour.

The highways of philosophy and mysticism are open to few. And yet who would imagine that the truths of Islam, so noble and dignified, could exist outside the confines of lofty and profound philosophy? We need only to remember the transformation made by Muhammad (on whom be peace!) in the wandering tribes of Arabia to see how so simple yet all-embracing a faith has conquered ignorant and learned alike. Faith is necessary, but it leads to comfortable repose and sleep. Faith must give way to Vision. And Vision is Islam.

ISLAM.

PRINCIPLES OF ISLAM.

I.

KNOW, child, that God is only one,
And has no partner nor a Son;
He has made us and everything,
All beasts, all fowls, all birds that sing,
The sun, the moon, the starry sky,
The land, the sea, and mountains high.

He knows whate'er we think or act,
 By him is seen the real fact,
 And only He does what He wills.
 He makes, He keeps, He saves, He kills.
 Fore'er the Same, no age, no youth,
 He is Perfection, He is Truth.
 Almighty, everything, wise,
 He hath not form or shape or size,
 But self-existing is our Lord,
 And is always to be adored.

II.

Our God is just and loves the right,
 The wrong is hateful to His sight.
 To all His creatures He is kind,
 But most to us of human kind.
 He gave us Reason that we might
 Know good from bad and wrong from right.
 This is the first to light our path,
 To gain His grace and shun his wrath.
 But gift of Reason varies far,
 Some wise and others foolish are ;
 The eyes of mind our passion dims,
 And Reason oft is quenched by whims.

III.

For second guide we have the men
 Of larger mind and wider ken,
 Who could from God a message get,
 His law before the people set.
 We call them Prophets, know you well,
 Coming events they could foretell.
 No nation was without such guide,
 To warn them, and from sins to chide.
 Each Prophet taught in His own sphere,
 To worship God and Him to fear.
 But thousands of such Prophets came,
 Of whom we now know not the name.
 Of some well known I mention make :
 The Lord God bless us for their sake !
 Job, Jacob, Joseph, Abraham,
 Elias, David, Solomon,
 Lot, Moses, Aaron, Ishmael,
 Hod, Noah, Jesus, Daniel ;
 With Adam first and Muhammad last
 Between the two all others passed,
 Their minds were brighter than our own,
 But otherwise all flesh and bone ;
 God did not in them corporate,
 They were but men and separate.

IV.

The Books of God a third guide form,
 And us of His commands inform.
 God sent them through His Prophets great,
 Repealing older by the late ;
 The Kuran now the law in force,
 The other Books have run their course.

V.

In all these Books 'tis plainly said
 The graves will once give up their dead ;
 A new life God will give to men,
 Who made us once will quick'n again,
 That day we shall, to judgment brought,
 Be called to answer what we wrought,
 And shall be judged by faith we had
 And work we did or good or bad.
 The good shall get a festive treat,
 E'erlasting bliss and heavenly seat,
 Where such the pleasure, such the mirth,
 We've never dreamt of on this earth.
 The bad shall go to hell and fire,
 And suffer pains and tortures dire,
 But sense of guilt to conscious mind
 Is more than all the pains combined ;
 While sense of having pleased our Lord
 Is greatest bliss and highest reward.

VI.

The Kuran teaches us to pray
 Our Lord God five times every day,
 To fast the days of Ramzan lent,
 To give alms to the indigent,
 To visit Mecca once in life,
 And to make for God every strife.
 Find here the Moslem laws in brief,
 May God guide all to this belief.

SAYYID MOHAMMAD.

Solar Jang Library, Hyderabad.



ISLAM—A PERFECT BROTHERHOOD.

THE sublime fraternity which exists between Muslims has been the wonder and admiration of many people, and they cannot realise why other creeds have lamentably failed, whilst Islam has actually brought about this desirable goodwill and fellowship. Miss Annie Small, in her little book "Islam," writes: "There is another Christian idea suggested by a study of Islam, which emerges from the last: the idea of the Brotherhood of the Father's children. This is of the very essence of Christianity as it is of Islam, but has never been carried into effect in the same magnificent way. There are various illustrations of this. The absence of all caste distinctions in Muslim society, the kindly relations which exist between master and servant, rich and poor, Musulmans of various races. Christianity has much to learn in these directions. Again, the desire to bring men within the Brotherhood is a passion with every true Muslim. . . . There is no caste in Islam, neither the Eastern nor the Western form of that system. Each man stands in the same relation to the God Who rules him, and the consequent brotherhood is a very real thing. Poor and rich are not divided; to be poor is in itself a claim, and if a poor man comes to a rich man for aid, the rich man regards it as a favour. The laws of hospitality are most noble; strangers are assured in any Muslim house of a welcome, a meal, a rest, and if need be, even of clothing. Hospitality is an act of worship. The aged are held in beautiful reverence; the poor, and especially the orphan, are cared for as a religious duty; in the home the patriarchal system still rules, the servant is a part of the family, and is treated with kindness. Is he not a brother in the Faith? . . . The Muslim is never ashamed to confess his Faith. His devotion to God and his loyalty to the Prophet are not matters too sacred for conversation. They are his deepest life, wherefore should he shun reference to them? When as much can be said of the members of each Christian church, much will be gained." These words from the pen of a lady who has studied all the religious systems and whose books may rightly be regarded as authorities upon these subjects, must find a responsive echo in the hearts of all who have come in contact with Muslims in any part of the world. Islam teaches absolute equality of all Muslims, and so false pride and arrogance have disappeared. Each one is taught that their duty to others should come before their own needs, that they will truly worship God if they serve humanity. After all, what is the use of beautiful formulas if they do not inspire us to lighten the burden of our fellow beings? God has provided, out of His mercy, everything to serve us, He has given impartially, not to a chosen race or a select few, but to mankind as a whole. Jesus taught this same

brotherhood, and it existed in the time of the first Apostles ; but gradually dogmas replaced these beautiful ethics which were given to mankind by him, and we find petty jealousies and wranglings over abstract ideas creeping in to the detriment of all that tends to promote goodwill. Thus the spirit seemed lost, and the four hundred odd different sects have disputed over points of variance, instead of coming together and selecting the teachings of Jesus as a basis, and lopping away from the tree of truth those man-made growths which stifle its growth and clog the progress of mankind. In Islam we have perfect freedom of thought, and yet are united ; we have not split up our creed into great or small divisions, but the brotherhood is a reality. A Muslim can go into any mosque and say his prayers, can mix with brethren from America or China or Japan on terms of affection and equality. God made all men with the same potentialities, all are born equal, and leave this world equal ; therefore, any difference in status is man-made, and never intended by God. In the Mosque we have no pews, but all stand side by side, to quote the words of Julius R. Van Milligen, in his book " Turkey," in the chapter on " The Faith of Islam : " " The luxurious inhabitant of the East, who in his selamluk is wont to recline on cushions, does not pass into the House of God to tenant a crimson-lined and well-padded pew ; he takes his place among the crowd—the effendi stands beside the water-carrier, the boy near the charcoal-vendor—he is but one item among many ; he arrogates to himself no honour in the temple where all men are as one family." Thus one can see at a glance that worldly distinctions are impossible where Islam is the faith held by the people. What a glorious lesson to the world ! If this had only been the case in Europe at the present day, would this terrible war have been possible ? Then again, in the house, the servant is a brother, he renders certain services which are necessary to the well-being of all, and therefore adds his quota to the general happiness. Is he despised because he performs menial tasks ? Why should he be, when our Holy Prophet himself swept the floor and cobbled his own shoes ? The scavenger performs a task which is of vital importance to all, and therefore is not degraded by his labour ; but earns respect if he be a godly man, and can mix with all his brethren without any reserve. Then again, to be poor is regarded by some as a sufficient excuse for passing by ; is this right ? Certainly not, here are our opportunities, which we must not neglect, God has given freely to all, therefore, if we are able to cheer one less fortunate and to help him on his way, to gladden his heart by a friendly greeting and conversation, should we not do so ? This is the teaching of Islam. Again, too, there is an absence of the racial or colour prejudice among Muslims. The Brotherhood of Islam is the common property of the world. A white man is no better for having a pale skin, neither is a black man nobler for the presence of this pigment ; a yellow man is just

as much a creature of God as any other. Also the question of nationality is of small importance. Accident of birth contributes to this; a man in Europe is no better for having been born outside Asia, and *vice versa*, therefore among Muslims there is perfect connexion and freedom whether the man is African, European, Asiatic or Polynesian, whether his skin be fair or tawny. These wretched distinctions of caste, colour, and race have stood in the way of a united world, have hindered the complete understanding of the peoples, and have prevented the realisation of the Kingdom of God on earth. All these are the creation of man's own egotism, and true religion must sweep away all these noxious fungi which choke the growth of fraternity. The aged have every claim upon our reverence; they have been pioneers in the world, and it is by their experience that we are taught to avoid many errors. They have fought that we, their children, may be strengthened and helped; they have laboured and cared for us when we were incapable of doing anything by our own effort, they have suffered that we may live, and thus we should hold them very dear, and give them all proper respect. We should never be afraid to confess our Faith, rather we should be glad of the opportunity to do so. We owe all to Allah; then should we be ashamed to own Him? We see around us people less fortunate than ourselves; but they are His children. Then why not try to bring them into the family? Let us look at our own life, let us be guided by the high principles which are laid down by Islam, and we shall find a million opportunities waiting for us, and we can each do our share to produce happiness, peace, and brotherhood amongst those who sorely need it. Never mind difference of creed or any other obstacle; these should not be allowed to stand in our way, to prevent us doing what is right, but should rather inspire us to a greater effort. Let us follow the saying of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (on whom be peace!): "No man is a true believer unless he desireth for his brother that which he desireth for himself." Let us be selfless, and heaven itself will be mirrored upon this planet of ours.

SHAIK KHALID SHELDRAKE.

WHAT IS DOGMA?

By LORD HEADLEY.

(Saif-ur-Rahman Shaikh Rahmatullah Farooq.)

I NOW reproduce two letters which have recently reached me, together with my answers. I do not give the names of the writers, but, as they are evidently earnest inquirers after truth, I feel sure that either or both of them will be pleased to correspond

with any of the readers of the *Islamic Review*, either directly or through these columns.

LETTER ON DOGMA AND THE ATONEMENT.

"Dear Lord Headley,

"I do not quite follow your objection to *dogmatic* teaching. Dogma, as I understand it, is the categorical affirmation of some hard (*i.e.*, true) fact, and, if the fact is true, surely it cannot be too categorically (*i.e.*, dogmatically) affirmed or taught. The religion of Jesus Christ is one of hard facts; indeed, so far as they concern man—his life, death, and subsequent existence—the hardest in the universe. One of the chief of these is that, as Sinai shows us, no sinful man or woman (and who is not sinful?) can dare to approach the All-Just and All-Holy Creator except in the manner appointed by Him—that is, through His Son our Lord Jesus Christ. The idea expressed, therefore, in the lines in June *Islamic Review* by Alice Welch—

'I reverence Christ as messenger Divine

But want to send my prayers to God straight to His
heart from mine,'

is absolutely impossible. No such prayers, except from a perfectly holy creature, would be acceptable; and no such creature in the form of man has ever existed except our Lord Christ. This may be dogma, but it is also ordinary common sense, if we realise the perfect justice, as well as perfect holiness of the Almighty. How can He have to do with, or listen to unholy men who dare to come into His presence in their sins? And when I read the Muslim's Prayer, I ask how can the Muslim, *knowing Christ*, dare to venture into God's presence without Him—putting Him, as it were, on one side? The Israelite who did so at Mount Sinai would have been destroyed on the spot, and God's forbearance now does not make the presumption any less. *Christ was without sin*. Is the same claimed for Mahomet? His history in the same *Review* hardly seems to show it.

"I regret more than I can say to read your words that you cannot believe in the Atonement. Those who refuse to come to the Almighty on the ground of the Atonement, must come to him on the ground of Sinai—that is, of the Law: a terrible ground indeed, for the penalty of not one transgression can be remitted. God's *justice* requires this; but God's *mercy* provided a way of escape for sinners—viz., faith in, and personal acceptance of, His own Son as a Saviour, whom He sent to die on the Cross as a substitute for the sinner. . . .—Yours, &c.,

"——."

Reply.

"Dear Mr. ——,

Again I have to say that there is a difficulty in our joining issues on the subject under discussion, because we do not at

present quite agree even on the meaning of the words we use. For this reason I had not intended writing again, but your last letter is so kindly expressed that I feel I must endeavour to answer it.

I take it that dogma—in the religious sense—is a definite form of doctrine affirmed positively by and promulgated by the authority of some particular religious sect. Thus I well remember, about forty years ago, a dignitary of the Church of England, who was engaged in preparing myself and relations for confirmation, alluded to the Blessed Virgin Mary as the “Mother of God,” and, as he supplied us with small books in which she was so described, I ventured to ask on what authority the statement was made. The reply was: “Oh, the Church sanctions it.” I said: “Which Church?” for there are so many branches of the Christian Church—Romish, Greek, Protestant, Lutheran, Nonconformist, &c., &c. His reply was, “the Anglican Church.” This, then, is an example of the dogmas of the Anglican Church.

The necessity for baptism and other sacraments, real or symbolical, are dogmas of the other Christian Churches. The doctrine of the Trinity is dogma; also the belief in the Divinity of Christ is looked upon as absolutely necessary to salvation, and is strictly dogmatic; and belief in the necessity for the atonement is also dogmatic.

Islam seems to stand alone in its freedom from dogma, belief in and submission to God and beneficence to all one's fellow-creatures being sufficient for salvation; and we are also taught to believe in the Day of Judgment, the angels, and the teachings of those holy prophets who have been Divinely inspired since the beginning of the world. We do not believe in the necessity for any mediation because we feel that God is ever present with each one of us and is accessible to all, and we do not believe in the Atonement because the substitution of another relieves us of all responsibility to the Almighty Being who made us what we are, and must therefore be capable of judging us.

The complications, such as sacerdotal interference and saintly intercession, prayers to the Virgin and saints, or to any other than the One Great King of the Universe, seem to us to savour of blasphemy.

I feel sure that you will admit that there is a grand simplicity in Islam . . .—Yours, &c.,

H.”

This answer is very incomplete, and I hope that some other Muslim brother more learned than myself will undertake the task of replying to the question as to the evidence obtainable regarding the lives of Christ and Muhammad. There appears to be no doubt that, of the two, the Holy Prophet of Arabia had more opportunities of acting under different conditions of poverty and affluence, weakness and strength, &c., and of

exercising more worldly power than fell to the lot of the Holy Prophet of Nazareth. It must, I think, also be admitted that Christ's advice, "And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak forbid not to take thy coat also," is not suitable for human beings, and would, if carried into practice, lead to a large increase of the criminal population in any community. If, at the outbreak of the European War, we had literally carried Christ's precept into effect we should have said to Germany, "By all means take Belgium, and you can also have our colonies, and the British Fleet is entirely at your disposal, as well as anything of value you may find in the Bank of England or the British Museum." There are, unfortunately, a few misguided and unpatriotic persons, calling themselves British, who would willingly hand over our glorious Empire to the modern Huns; but they are only traitors, and their seditious utterances are drowned in universal acclamations coming from Canada, India, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the other portions of the Empire. Muhammad always showed himself most merciful and chivalrous, but he thoroughly believed in protecting himself and his followers against wrongful aggression. He did not believe in encouraging any form of cruelty or wrong. for he saw that in letting off the culprit great injustice was done to other members of a community. Shakespeare's line, "Mercy but murders, pardoning those that kill," might indeed have been a motto inscribed on one of the Holy Prophet's banners.

The second letter to which I allude contains questions which are even more difficult to reply to. It runs as follows:—

"Dear Lord Headley,

"As an inquirer after truth, I shall be very pleased if you will give me some information as to the real belief of a Mahomedan regarding a hell. Judging by some of your articles in *Muslim India*, I am of the opinion that you do not hold to the old belief in a place of torment by fire; and yet I am told by two Mahomedan friends that they are bound to believe in it according to the Quran. I am a non-sectarian Unitarian—i.e., I believe in the Unity of God, but cannot be a member of any particular sect.

"Also I should like to know the view of an advanced Muslim regarding 'miracles.' I am sorry to trouble you, but I know of no other Englishman from whom I can get the information required.—Yours, &c.,

"_____."

"Dear Sir,

Reply.

I am much obliged for your letter. Your first question is a difficult one to answer, for Muslims, like Christians, give different interpretations to the word "Hell" which appears in

their sacred volumes. Many Muslims believe that there is an actual physical burning and torture of their bodies in a future state ; whilst others hold that the tortures of hell are symbolical of the sufferings which they say must follow the consciousness of having done evil on earth. All through the Bible and the Quran there are, as you know, repeated detailed references to hell fires and the sufferings of the damned. In the Quran particularly hell fire seems to be the special punishment for infidelity or idolatry—"We have appointed hell the prison of the infidels." Again, speaking of those who cavil at the signs of God : "When the collars shall be on their necks and the chains to drag them into hell ; then in the fire shall they be burned." "Enter ye the portals of hell to abide therein for ever. And, wretched the abode of the haughty ones !" I could give very many more quotations to show that if the Quran and the Bible were taken literally no unbeliever would escape hell fire. My own impression is—though, of course, I am not really much of an authority—that the Holy Prophets at the time they were inspired to write were making desperate efforts to put down vice and wickedness of the most awful nature, and that the need of purification was always uppermost in their minds ; certainly the state of Arabia in Muhammad's time, the human sacrifices and fiendish cruelties seemed to need burning out with hell fires, and it appears only natural that inspirations from on high guided the Prophet to proclaim the vengeance of the Almighty. I believe, myself, that every really wrongful act carries with it its own little bit of hell, and that no human being is altogether free from those regrets which are bound to follow the commission of any ill-deed.

With regard to miracles, may I ask you to read the first chapter of my little book, "A Western Awakening to Islam," as you will then gather that I firmly believe in the miracles ; indeed, I do not see why anyone believing in God's infinite power should find it difficult to believe that He can at any time suspend or alter the ordinary laws of Nature. If we do not believe in miracles we must regard the Gospels and other sacred writings as a conglomeration of fairy tales.—Yours, &c.,

H."

Though I never had any doubts about God's power to alter or suspend His own laws, I can understand the feelings of others on the subject. As a matter of fact, I find that nine people out of ten of my acquaintance do not believe in the truth of any of the supernatural events found in the Old and New Testaments. To such as find it impossible to credit the miraculous happenings on scientific grounds, we may advance the theory that man has not yet comprehended all the virtues or attributes with which atoms of the universe are charged, and which are continually being discovered by the scientists. Man calls a thing "miraculous" because he perceives an exhibition of a novel character demonstrated in certain natural phenomena.

The failure of human ken to describe or account for a phenomenon cannot go to deny its existence or its happenings. This may afford an explanation to scientific minds: perfectly natural conditions of the atmosphere give rise to most wonderful apparitions—*e.g.*, the mirage, *ignis fatuus*, Pepper's Ghost, &c., &c.—but to my mind none of these is of the nature of that miracle which restores the dead to life or feeds five thousand people on a few loaves and fishes.

I felt a little diffidence in expressing an opinion on the subject of punishment in the future state, since it is one which has been so variously treated by philosophers and theologians of all ages, and could only give the general idea that the consciousness of doing wrong is in itself so painful to a well-disposed individual that it actually constitutes hell or a portion of hell. As God is the All-Just, as well as the All-Merciful, and He alone can decide the punishments to be awarded to different individuals, it seems probable that there will be degrees as to the intensity and duration of future sufferings. Only the Almighty can weigh the shortcomings of His creatures, for He alone knows the extent of their power to resist evil. It is to my mind inconsistent with both justice and mercy to believe that any frail human creature will be made to suffer infinite torments as a punishment for very finite transgressions.

HEADLEY.

MISSIONARY PROPAGANDA.

THROUGHOUT the world there are to-day thousands of missionaries, each hoping for the ultimate triumph of their particular creed. When one looks around and sees the four hundred and ninety odd different sects of Christendom alone, it seems very strange that these well-meaning people have been so blind to the great need for their services at home. People lavishly subscribe to "Foreign Missions," and are so zealous for the "heathen" that they conveniently forget the great and pressing duty which lies at their door. The present war has thrown out into strong relief the petty partisanship of the different Churches. Some are eager for the total extinction of the German forces; others are proclaiming from the pulpit that the terrible calamities are the "judgment of God." Some say that the Churches are right in praying for and blessing the forces in the field; others say that all war is contrary to the teachings of the Bible. Many are complaining that through her internal dissensions the "Church of Christ" is impotent to-day, and instead of being a power in the world is a nonentity. One strong factor seems to possess the members of every one of these sects, and that is the desire to convert others to their own particular form of doctrine, whilst at the same time abusing all others! How curious it is?

It seems that the teachings of Jesus are so complex that mankind, even after nearly two thousand years, is still in doubt about his doctrines, and each person blessed with a fervent imagination commences to teach his own idea, and thus, attracting others, forms a new sect. When Rome was at its height there was unity in Christendom, but no sooner does Protestantism gain an advantage than we find various sects springing up, each seizing upon a particle of truth, ignoring the context, and thinking itself the "only true Faith." What a great pity that this should be so! Education in Europe has paved the way for a critical examination of all the religious teachings, and that is just the reason why Christianity has always fought so strongly against progress and enlightenment; for it knew that when people began to think for themselves it would be the beginning of the end. In Europe we find that the bulk of the people have drifted into indifferentism, are careless of religious observance, and frankly admit that they have no belief in the Christian dogmas; and these people are neither immoral nor blasphemous, but right-living men and women. True it is that many people who are often termed "the old school" still rigidly adhere to the orthodox creed, but they are in a hopeless minority. Hence we have the peculiar spectacle of armies of Christian missionaries going abroad to preach the "Gospel" which is rejected by their own countrymen. There are huge societies, with thousands of yearly subscribers, who donate millions of pounds for the conversion of the non-Christian peoples; Bibles are circulated by hundreds, and thus we should expect that the result would be an enormous number of "conversions" every year. What really occurs? We will try to see. Let us imagine an African tribe who are pagans, who live quietly, are industrious, and worship some tribal fetish. An Anglican missionary appears and commences to teach his doctrine, telling the people that their idol is impotent, and that if they enter the fold of the Church they will receive blessings in the shape of Bishops, Priests, ceremonies, &c., &c., and be made children of God. They listen to the man who has built himself a nice house, and has servants and gives away medicines. Then a Reverend Father of the Catholic Church appears, and contradicts the statements made by the Anglican; he unfolds the mysteries of the Mass, of the infallibility of the Pope, and asks them to adore the "Blessed Virgin"; he gives them candles to burn and rosaries to wear; him they follow for a time. But then a Baptist, a Wesleyan, a Reformed Lutheran, a Quaker, and many other missionaries appear in turn, all calling themselves Christian, but all being equally divided in their teachings, and contradicting the other. The Chief and the tribe are non-plussed, and ask themselves if their own particular idol is not just as good as the strange gods that the missionaries preach. Their mind is unable to grasp the picturesque mysticism of the "Three are One and One is Three" doctrine, and the missionaries are surprised to find that their message remains un-

heeded by the bulk of the people. They appeal for more money, more books, and more blankets or other articles of clothing, which, when donned by the African, would be the delight of a cartoonist. Then they write home glowing accounts of a "certain woman" and a "certain man" in a "certain village," to satisfy the subscribers of their particular society, hoping that some day they may obtain a good preferment at home, and enjoy the plaudits of the congregations when they return and recount their "experiences" to a Young Men's Bible Class, a Young Women's Guild, or a Mothers' Meeting. Meanwhile, they regard each other with distrust, hinder the work done by their rivals, and carry jealousy into the midst of a people to whom it has hitherto been unknown. If one of them is a little too fanatical and meets with punishment he wires to the nearest station for "help," and along come traders, a gun-boat, or a troop of soldiers, who proceed to "pacify" the people, which really means depriving them of their independence. If this should not occur, the missionary writes home stories of the dangers to which he is exposed, and we read a full account in the Missionary Journal or the local Parish Magazine. Then comes a new factor: a trader appears who is akin to the tribe in colour, who speaks their tongue as his own, who enters into commercial relations with the people, who has a hut with theirs instead of a large house set apart. He is a religious man, too, for five times a day he spreads a mat and prostrates himself in prayer. The tribe look on in wonder, and when he pulls from his robe a book, to which he pays every reverence and reads often, which is filled with strange flowing characters, they become interested, and ask him questions. He does not tell them that he worships a Virgin, or a Three-in-One Person, that he wishes to wash them in Baptism, that they must believe in the "Blood of the Lamb"; he tells them of the One Supreme Being who cares for and sustains all mankind—black, yellow, or white. He eats with them, walks with them, talks with them. They like his clothes, his manners, his customs; there is nothing in his belief that they cannot understand, and they are curious to hear more and more from his lips. He teaches them little by little those curious characters in the book, and tells them of "Allah," and of "Our Holy Prophet Muhammad," and they begin to respect him for his wisdom. They begin to look askance at their fetish, and in the end throw it on one side as a piece of wood, and they begin to worship as the trader does. He teaches them to refuse intoxicating liquors, to dress decently, to be clean, and to do what they have done before—to live peaceably and happily with each other. Soon many of the people understand and join in the prayers with him, and the Chief himself realises the good that has come about. He orders his men to build a hut to be used as a place of worship, and then finally with all his tribe he embraces Islam, the religion of the trader. He finds nothing in it which he

cannot comprehend, nothing which makes him puzzle his brains to decipher, and finally to give up in disgust; but he learns to love "Allah, the Merciful, the Compassionate," and soon he, too, sends men to the tribes around him to ask them to come and join in a palaver to listen to the "Word of Allah." Thus it is that, in spite of all these paid agents of Christianity, the pagan becomes Muslim, and then the missionaries are compelled to write home calling attention to the "Muslim peril," and frantically asking for help to win "Africa for Christ." They admit defeat, and do not try to understand where they themselves are lacking, but vilify Islam with all the foulest epithets possible. Finding their position impossible, that they are hopelessly beaten, they remove elsewhere, to commence again, only to meet with the same result. Try to understand the situation: Christianity has huge organisations, enormous sums of money flowing freely, a veritable array of talented agents, with medicines and books, garments, and other things calculated to interest the non-Christian peoples, their missionaries having nothing to do but to preach all day, well supplied by funds from home; and they are beaten by a Muslim trader, who does not preach but lives Islam, and the force of his example is so powerful that the tribes follow him, although he has nothing to give them, is a simple man like themselves, who is paid by no one, has no society behind him, but who has to trade and earn his daily bread in their midst. Thus is Africa being won for Allah. The Muslim does not ask the tribe to dress like Europeans, does not ask them to ape Western civilisation, but to live a proper life. He does not require them to worship a man-god, but to adore the Creator of the Universe. Christian efforts must fail when brought in contact with Islam, for they lack spirituality, unity, self-sacrifice, and offer salvation for belief in a dogma, instead of giving a code for life to the inquirer. Islam is spreading throughout the world in such a remarkable manner that Christendom is impotent to impede its march. Converts who are made by Christian missionaries invariably become Muslim. Europeans are embracing Islam every day, and the decaying Church has now to face a new difficulty—how to combat the advance of Islam among the thinking classes of the West. No longer will the combat be a one-sided one—that of going abroad—but the numerous conversions to Islam in England alone will cause serious anxiety to the Church machinery. To meet this difficulty the Christians must first of all seek out the true Bible; they must investigate and become sure of the authenticity of the book upon which they base their beliefs; they must find out what it is that causes them to be so divided, must settle their own internal squabbles, throw aside the teachings which are not those of Jesus, and which are man-made errors. They must learn that great lesson of charity, disband their paid organisations, appeal afresh to the people, teaching the true Faith, which is not wrapped up in such a

clothing of fables and ceremonies, and must become more broad-minded, understanding that the Jews were not a "chosen race," but only a small fraction of God's family. When the Church has done this she will find that there will be no quarrel between her and Islam, for to her utter surprise she will discover that her teachings are identical with those of the Muslim trader. Then we can picture a world-peace, a fraternity of mankind, no jangling and disputing over empty phrases and doctrines, but all living a life in accord with the Will of God Himself.

A WESTERNER.

A SPIRIT IN PRISON.

O GIVE me the desert sands
Where dissension is not heard,
Where all is at peace and still,
Not even the cry of a bird.

O give me the slowly moving tents
And the camel's patient pad,
Give me the land where Islam reigns
And the human heart is glad.

Open the doors, give me liberty,
Let me hear the Muezzin ring.
Help me to reach the little Moque,
And take a poor wanderer in.

AMEENA.

THE OUTCAST.

I HAVE trodden the streets of the city
And the public park and square—
I have looked for an answering glance to mine,
But have not found one there.

I have watched the dark faces of pansies
In the garden by the sea,
But they remain for ever silent,
And they will not answer me.

They laugh at my faith and mock me,
Who cannot comprehend;
They know that I am defenceless,
Possessing ne'er a friend.

But perhaps in the dreary struggle,
As I hold to Allah fast,
I shall leave the drear desert behind me,
And find an oasis at last.

AMEENA.

THE TRUE MEANING OF SOME OF THE THINGS OF CHRIST.

[A learned exposition of some of the most important teachings of Jesus Christ, by Rev. J. J. Brown, who has contributed it to our Journal.]

INTRODUCTION.

I'm almost afraid to begin, for I know that I'm on highly debateable ground. So I must ask you to bear with me as well as you can. I'm about to touch on a very sensitive part, in fact, the very apple of the eye, of the faith of some.

The Atonement. It means an at-one-ment, a reconciliation. But turn up an encyclopædia, "Chambers" for instance, and you find about a score of theories regarding it from the time St. James and St. Paul debated about faith and works until the present. Now let me say at once that true faith is full belief that God sent Christ to show us a more excellent way of life, and that if we submit to God and Christ and strive to walk in that more excellent way we shall be saved. False faith is a belief in a particular dogma of the Atonement to this effect that Christ suffered for us the penalty of our sins, satisfied Divine justice thereby, and that it is essential to believe this before we can be saved; that, in fact, if we do not believe this we shall be damned.

THE TRUE MEANING OF SOME OF THE THINGS OF CHRIST.

Here are two lines from a well-known hymn:—

"On Christ, the solid rock, I stand:
All other ground is sinking sand."

There are two meanings in which we may take these lines, however, the popular evangelical meaning and the meaning in which Christ himself would have us take them.

The popular evangelical meaning is pretty much that Christ has done everything and we can do nothing.

"Nothing either great or small,
Nothing, sinner, know,
Jesus died and paid it all,
Long, long, ago."

So some popular evangelic preachers call on whosoever will to believe this—to believe that Christ paid our legal debt and with this belief as a passport to pass into heaven.

Christ calls on whosoever will also, but he carefully points out what the rock really is on which we should stand and what really is the sinking sand. Listen (Matt. vii. 24-27): "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth

them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. And everyone that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it."

There is a terribly wrong notion abroad that God forgives us our debt because Christ has paid it to Him. That's not forgiveness at all, at least it is not the kind that Christ teaches. Let us read Matt. xviii. 23-35. Note verse 27: "The Lord was moved with compassion and loosed him and forgave him the debt." Forgave him, remitted the debt freely, not that anyone paid it to him for him.

Note verse 33: "Shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant even as I had pity on thee?" Suppose that someone had paid to this wicked servant the debt of this fellow servant and thus freed the fellow servant, could we have called that forgiveness on the part of the wicked servant? No. Yet the popular notion is that God's forgiveness is of that fashion.

It would be easy to forgive after that fashion. Note verse 35: The Lord was now wroth with the wicked servant, and mark you, cancelled his forgiveness, and handed him over till he should pay all that was due unto him, and says Christ, "Likewise shall my Heavenly Father do also unto you if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

Let us look now at the Lord's Prayer. Matt. vi. 12-14 and 15: "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." The Lord himself makes a comment on this. He says: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses your Heavenly Father will also forgive you." There's the conditions of God's forgiveness. If a man tells me he knows his sins are forgiven through the blood and not on these conditions, I know that he is under a delusion. Listen: "If ye forgive men not their trespasses neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." It's the golden rule, "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the Prophets," says Christ (Matt. vii. 12). Christ says again (Matt. vii. 2): "With what measure ye meet it shall be measured to you again." That is good or bad, as the case may be, God will see to it. God is sovereign. He will judge as he sees fit. As a sovereign He can forgive freely without a substitute if the conditions warrant. And we, too, ought to remit freely without compensation, if the conditions warrant. Of course, one necessary condition of forgiveness is repentance. Christ says (Luke xvii. 4) that if thy brother trespass against thee and turn again to thee saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him. Christ even asked God to forgive his enemies on the score of their ignorance. "Father,

forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Luke xxiii. 34). Oh! Christ's sentiment is so different from the sentiment that mercy cannot be met unless justice pays the last farthing. I like Christ's teaching. Look at the parable again (Matt. xviii. 25), forasmuch as he had not to pay he was about to be sold off. So he fell down and worshipped and besought for patience, for, mark you, he intended yet to pay all. That was true repentance. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion and loosed him and forgave him his debt. Compassion like that, love like that, is a higher justice, is a deeper justice, than the surface sort of justice. It would have been unjust to have sought a substitute here.

The parable of the prodigal son is a parallel case (Luke xv. 11), when the prodigal became thoroughly repentant, when he resolved to throw up his bad life and cast himself on his father, even though he be made as one of his father's hired servants. Then, when he was yet at a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him. No mention here of any substitute to suffer the penalty of his sin. The father freely forgives—freely, mark you. Now, if God cannot forgive us our debts without a substitute to pay our debts to Him, neither should we be asked to forgive our debtors without compensation. But God asks us to forgive freely because He himself forgives freely. To believe that Christ has paid and done all for us and to press God for our forgiveness on that account is off the mark, and is not the conditions of forgiveness at all.

What, then, is the true meaning of the death of Christ? Why did he die?

In 1895 I wrote the following, which was printed in the *Investigator*, and gave rise to a discussion therein in which I joined:—

"A BIT OF MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

"Did Christ die for us as a substitute, suffering in his soul at his death the exact amount in one concentrated pang of what the whole world would have suffered in its everlasting punishment for its sins? Or,

"Did Christ die for us as a missionary amongst savages, God foreseeing that of necessity the only way to raise us on a large scale would be to send His son to sacrifice his life amongst us in instructing us in the rules of righteousness that whosoever, believing of course that Christ was 'sent' of God, should give heed to these rules of righteousness would be saved?

"That Christ suffered what we should have suffered is nonsense and will not stand the light of pure reason for a moment.

"That Christ died as a missionary the while he was delivering God's message to us, is the only reasonable and scriptural aspect

of the case. God knew that men left to themselves would become corrupt, but He so loved the world that He determined to send His own son to teach men the true way of life. He saw that in so doing His son would be taken by the wild men and killed. Nevertheless He gave, He sacrificed His willing son for us. This was in His thoughts when He tried Abraham about Isaac. And the sacrifices of all the ages foreshadowed this great sacrifice. So Christ came and God bore witness to the message that he came with. Everything to us depends upon how we obey the message Christ delivered. Blessed are we in proportion as we obey. The rules of righteousness as taught by Christ are essential in the extreme."

When copies of the above were done I wrote out others, varying the words a little, but not the sense, for public and private correspondence. One appeared in the Southern Press here in Glasgow. I despatched another to a private correspondent in the United States, America, and after a while I received the following letter:—

"Dear Mr. Brown,—

"You will perceive by the enclosed that I have taken the liberty to print your MS which you kindly sent me; I hope it is no offence to you. My object was to counteract the blind guide's teachings of a millennial dawn man who was speaking in our city on the 17th of this month. I got 500 printed, and hired two men to distribute them to the people as they entered the hall. I feel sure they will be blessed to some by our Heavenly Father, because I know I was led by the spirit of God in the matter.

"CHRISTADELPHIAN."

The following is an exact copy of what he printed:—

(Abstract from a manuscript of J. J. Brown, 300 Cathcart Road, Glasgow, Scotland.)

"Abruptly from his rhetorical climax, and whether to the point or not, he points us to Christ, who died for us as our great substitute. All this is very good. But there are two senses in which Christ can be considered as our great substitute. One is really sense, while the other is nonsense. Which is which let us now judge. One is that Christ died for us as our substitute, suffering in his soul at his death the exact amount in one concentrated pang of what the whole world would have suffered in its everlasting punishment for its sins. And that if we believe this we go legally free. While, if we don't accept this, then we will have to suffer or pay again the full penalty ourselves. The other is that Christ died for us as a substitute in the sense in which a missionary lives and dies or gives himself for the heathen, that the son of God ventured amongst us at the cost of his life, teaching us the principles of God's government, and by his life and death

leaving us an example that we should follow in his steps. And that believing on him we must obey and follow him if we would be saved. And that in this way he gave himself a ransom for many. For the idea is that last of all God sent His son into this heathen world to give us this message of life ; and that, to give us this message of life aright, His son had from the sheer necessities of the case to become a missionary martyr. This idea shows us the all-essential importance of our giving heed to the message, to the teaching, to the example which cost so much. And since heaven has thus put forth its utmost effort to raise us we must also put forth our utmost effort to rise.

"Whereas the other and more popular idea that Christ has done all for us, that his righteousness is imputed to us, and that we have nothing to do but to accept that, is a most dangerous delusion."

So much for that. Perhaps I'm bringing too much of my personal views ; but the double repetition of the contrasted ideas may fix them firmer.

We must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, not only that he died for us, but also that he lived for us. Believing this involves the hearing, keeping, and obeying of his words and the following of his examples as far as we can, even unto a sacrificial death or martyrdom if need be.

If Christ was anything he was consistent in his words and actions.

He advises us to love our enemies, to pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us. So he himself practised what he preached. He gave us not only the precept but the example when, on the bitter cross, he prayed, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." Are we able to follow his example? It is necessity's utmost way of raising fallen men. When all has been tried, then if this fails, nothing will lift. Almost all of Christ's apostles followed Christ this way. That the cup that Christ drank was a cup of missionary martyrdom is seen also from Matt. xxii. and xxiii. Are ye able, asks Christ, to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with? They, the two disciples, say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with. Christ's death was an example to us how to behave under similar circumstances. He died for our sins, the "for" there has the force of the word "because" in it. "He died" "because" of our sins. Was wounded "because" of our transgressions, he was bruised because we were wicked enough to kill him. God allowed it for our example and good. The idea that Christ suffered for us, suffered the consequences of our sins, suffered the punishment due to our sins, is most incorrect. For every man, every Christian even as well, who sins suffers the conse-

quence in himself, sustains a loss more or less in proportion to his sins. But, on the other hand, in proportion as we keep the Commandments of Christ, in that proportion we are saved from sin and its consequences. If ye love me, says Christ (John xiv. 15, 21, 23, 24), keep my Commandments. He that hath my Commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings, and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me. Again (John xv. 7, 10, 12, 13): If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. If ye keep my Commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's Commandments and abide in His love. This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. This is the true gospel of the kingdom which the popular theology about Christ's death has wellnigh eclipsed. Oh! let us listen to Christ before even St. Paul, or the other Apostles, or even before Moses or the prophets, "Hear ye him."

THE ETHICS OF THE WAR.

PERHAPS there are some who, on reading the above title, will be inclined to say that war is unethical, or that it is opposed to ethics. Within certain limits I quite agree. War at all times is detrimental to culture and progress. It is a retarding force for the time being of the higher spiritual aspirations of the people, tending to bring into action many earlier and lower moral qualities, base motives and feelings which in times of peace are stagnant, and which religious and spiritual development is gradually forcing into the background and making more and more rudimentary. Culture has spread rapidly during the last one hundred years, the era of universal peace seemed near at hand; the majority of humanity in the leading countries of Europe appeared to be advanced enough, to be intelligent enough, to settle every difference without resorting to arms. As usual, our ideals were better and nobler than our practice. War is upon us. We require to recognise war as a fact—never more of a fact than at present. We are engaged in it. Averse to it we may be, at least some of us. But there are movements in nature and underlying currents in international diplomacy stronger than we are, which, moving onward through the years, drive many of us, even nations, into lines of conduct to which we have a repugnance. Truth, justice and right are greater than we are, and those very ethical principles which we have

imbibed and believe in may drive us into that course of action to which those very rules of ethics seem opposed.

It is generally agreed that bravery is superior to cowardice. Bravery, if it is in a just and truthful cause, is just as ethical as any of the recognised virtues. It may be well to point out that bravery can be divided into two kinds—physical bravery and moral bravery, or physical courage and moral courage. A man may be very brave physically, yet lack moral courage. He may be capable of heroic action on the field of battle amid shot and shell and be deficient in the stamina, in the moral backbone that, in the face of the sneers and persecutions of his friends and countrymen, stands undaunted and undismayed for an unpopular cause he believes to be true. On the other hand, the man of moral courage, who will for a cause he believes in face persecution and hatred and social ostracism, may yet shrink from pain himself and shrink from giving physical pain to others. Such men have, as the world knows, faced fire, and torture, and death fearless and steadfast for their opinions when necessary for their cause. Both kinds are worthy of approval in their own spheres. To me the man of moral courage is the greater of the two: from his ranks have been drawn the greatest prophets and teachers of humanity. If it were possible to blend in each one of us physical and moral courage of the highest nature and equal in volume, the result would be the ideal man, as near perfect as we can conceive. I do not know if ever such perfection is likely to be attained by you or I. Each of us varies in degree, if not in kind; some have more of the one, some more of the other nature. And I fear the majority show very little of the moral kind, yet such variation is the index of our action in all circumstances, in war as well as in peace. It is our character, and indicates the height or otherwise of our religion, of all those teachings we have garnered during our experience, and adopted as rules of conduct.

As to the ethics of any war in particular, the claim of justification is generally made by all the contending parties, both sides declaring themselves to be in the right. Outsiders generally see only the surface movements and have to judge on them; it is in most cases a generation or two after the event before historians can from material at their disposal give a correct and unbiassed opinion and outline of the whole affair. At a period such as this individual voices are lost in the general clamour, and even though heard are seldom listened to, at least with patience. In the present case Germany puts the blame on her opponents as the aggressors; the other side retaliates by accusing Germany. The looker-on stands amazed at the brilliance of the invective, the glamour of the adjectives, and the verbosity of the vocabulary. At such times dictionaries become obsolete through the numerous additions made to the language. So far as Britain was concerned, to the looker-on mentioned the neutrality of Belgium was the main point. We must test it in

that light. The Germans have maintained that the violation of the independence of Belgium "was vital to their strategy." The fact is, of course, conceded by everyone familiar with the situation; it was, no doubt, strategy—namely, cunning. No German, so far as I am aware, has attempted to justify the invasion of Belgium on the score of ethics, or to maintain it was morally justifiable or even right according to international law; in fact, the breaking of the treaty to which they were signatories is admitted. Such a method is certainly not ethical, and that at present is the only point I am concerned about. Britain, on the other hand, was not concerned at that period about strategy, either German, French, or Russian; the average Britisher I came in contact with desired to steer clear of war, there were exceptions, of course. To the average Britisher, therefore, the question seemed one of honour: the maintenance of a nation in whose neutrality and integrity they were interested, and to whom they gave their promise. That position was ethical. British statesmen looking far ahead may have seen the effect a German occupation would have in the future on British maritime and commercial supremacy. To the ordinary man-in-the-street the ethical action of keeping to our word and our honour untarnished was sufficient justification and the primary outlook. So much for the ethics of the controversy and actions which preceded and brought about the hostilities now in progress between the nations so far as they concern the British and the Germans. The case is clear, and it is not difficult for anyone to determine which nation stands on the side of ethics and for the noblest and highest spiritual ideals expounded by the great religious teachers of humanity, prophets and writers. It is the proud contention of Muslims in general that the followers of Islam are true to their word, and their sympathy should therefore be with the side whose word on any such occasion once given remains unbroken. The Prophet (on whom be peace!) agreed to an alliance with the Banu Bakr and promised them his protection. When they were attacked by the Kurayish, and appealed to him for justice and protection, he at once marched on Mecca to demand the first and to support his pledge. That example is enough for the Muslims. His word was his bond and the fall of Mecca the vindication thereof. That is from the view within the scope of the ordinary laymen not mixed up in the diplomatic intrigues of statesmen. It leaves out of account all secret agreements and negotiations that may have taken place between the Powers concerned on the one side or the other. Those matters are not likely to be available for study for a long time. When that time does arrive present opinions may be found to be wrong, and the blame discovered to rest in quarters unsuspected by us. So the most important part of the subject on which to build an ethical judgment has to be left out. Both sides are in the same position in that respect.

While war brings out those feelings classed under the spirit of manliness, determination, fearlessness, and every aspect of valour on the physical plane, it also brings into relief those principles classed as humanitarian, and looked upon, and rightly so, as the noblest virtues of the race—sympathy, unselfishness, kindness, and mercy. Funds are being raised for the relief of suffering, to aid those in distress, and the response to the appeal is quick and earnest. Ambulance corps are being raised, and the workers are plentiful. All methods that can be thought of are being put into operation to relieve those whom cold steel, bullet or shell has injured. In the agony of the wounded the finer sensibilities of the people are ushered to the surface. What has been lost to ethics on the one side is apparently gained on the other. Friend and foe alike are brought within this circle of pity, kindness and regard. Yet it is as well to remember that those finer feelings, acting as notable attributes, develop not in war-time, but during the period of peace. Were we always in the vortex of battle we would become hardened to the process and more and more callous to death and suffering. Familiarity breeds contempt, experience says, and in such circumstances it would through time destroy the tenderest motives and obliterate every element of human sympathy.

The most important aspect of the war from an ethical standpoint is that concerned with the actions of the various combatants during the actual hostilities. In what manner do our friends and our opponents conduct themselves towards each other, and especially towards the civil or non-combatant part of the population? There is an ethical rule which in a few words covers all such actions as between man and man, nation and nation, and religion and religion in peace and war, in physical and in mental struggle and controversy. It is the law of reciprocity, the Golden Rule :—

“Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you.”

Or better still, in its negative form :—

“Do not to others what ye would not have others do to you.”

The rule is almost universal in both the old civilisations and the new, in the East and the West. It is the fundamental rule of conduct taught by all the great Religious Prophets of the race, and if the people do not act up to it the fault lies with them, not to the teachers. While we take that law as a base on which to form a judgment, it will be best, perhaps, to give a more practical detailed example in case of differences of opinion as to the advisability of certain actions, or in opposition to the claim that some might put forward that you are quite at liberty to use certain methods against them if you can, as they propose employing them against you. In sending out his captains against the Byzantines to punish the murder of his Messenger, the Prophet (on whom be peace!) instructed them that, in

avenging the injuries inflicted upon the Muslims, the troops were not to :—

“Molest the harmless inmates of the houses. They were to spare the women. They were not to injure the children or those sick in bed. They were to abstain from demolishing the dwellings of the peaceful inhabitants, and were forbidden to destroy their means of sustenance, even the fruit trees on which they depended for nourishment.”*

The early Khalifs repeated those instructions to the soldiers with more detail as the circumstances required until they were recognised as the basic rules of all conduct in Islamic warfare. So far as the conduct of our own troops enters into the question, we can say nothing at present, simply because we know nothing. The Press Bureau has seen to that, the censorship curtails our data. They are acting at present in the country of the nation with whom we are allied—France. Should they ever enter the territory of the foe—which we hope they will, and soon—we trust they will act with the utmost chivalry, as gentlemen always do. In regard to the British Press, the matter is different. Judging it as a whole, I have no hesitation in saying that its attitude is unethical. The journalistic outpourings in Great Britain at present are unworthy of a great nation or a mighty people, strong in the justice and righteousness of the cause for which they have waged terrific battle. The cartoons, threats, jibes, rodomontade are undignified, and must surely tend to lower us in the eyes of neutrals. I personally, as a friend put it in a letter to me a few days ago, have no desire to tear the heart out of the Kaiser or to dip him in boiling oil. I have very little appreciation of him as a man, and I detest the system of militarism of which he is the head. I believe it would be better for Germany and the German people if they themselves dethroned him and overthrew the Hohenzollern dynasty. We, I hope, shall do our part in overthrowing the military system. While I know what Germans have done in the past, and the methods practised by some of them in, say, Togo-land, I do not look upon all Germans as scoundrels, and when I think of their opponents I also remember Siberia, the Congo, North Africa and the gallant and noble Abd-el-Kader; and, in spite of all, I am sure there are good men as well as bad men in all the nations contending, and I refuse to condemn the good men of a country or race on account of the bad; to do so would be to condemn the whole of humanity. While I am not prepared to accept unreservedly all the stories of German atrocities current in the Allied Press, I have received enough news from authentic sources to convince me that the German army in its path is indulging in a great deal of wanton and senseless

* I have given only the sense, not the exact words

destruction, giving unnecessary pain, causing unnecessary hardships, and meting out to the non-combatants cruel and quite uncalled-for punishments and persecutions. It is also evident that it is ordered in the most of cases, and in the others, extenuated by the officers being too widespread, to be the work of irresponsible soldiers—drunk with the lust of battle. I do not require to enter into details. The following extracts from a letter, which appeared in the "E.M.," October 16, p. 259, will be sufficient for my purpose, although far more barbarous things have been and are being reported.

Major J. J. Jackson, R.E.E., in a letter to his brother, writes:—

"A German officer who raised his handkerchief—which by-the-bye was a woman's, embroidered with the name Adèle, and no doubt plundered from some chateaux—advanced towards me, and, when about two yards away, suddenly whipped out his revolver and shot me in the left side. . . . In spite of my wound I was able to run him through.

"In his pocket we found the usual diary.

"Here are one or two extracts:—

"August 18.—Passed through Louvain to-day. My God! our boys have done their butcher's work well. I saw quite a number of women and children pass along the Rue de la Geannette. No doubt our boys had not seen them in time.

"August 28.—Dined at M. De la Ruffe's without his invitation. I have reported to the major the filthy condition the men had left all his rooms in—not a single piece of furniture is whole or unsoiled. I was lucky to find three bottles of Burgundy that escaped our boys attention."

These will do without my entrenching on the brutal and bestial. The first extract shows the use made of the white flag, the symbol of surrender and peace. The others from the German officer's diary speaks eloquently of the methods of the invaders, hinting at more than it details. The ill-treatment and degradation of the women is a thing that must revolt every one of us, and if ever the men who executed those outrages, the responsible men, can be found and come into our hands we would be justified in court-martialling them and punishing them according to law. Such actions will in the end receive the due reward. Here ethics have been thrown overboard. Peace, humanity, one brotherhood, that is the ideal. Peace, and we march in the path of ethics and ramble in the ways and byeways of science, we advance in culture and knowledge, and create interests and build up world-wide sympathies and develop all the finer attributes, the nobler qualities and the higher ideals of the race.

War! war in a hurricane of steel and shell, with its accompaniments of death and torture and pain and cruelty and devastation. All the work of peace is undone, all the teaching of religion and morality overthrown, the call of the Prophets seems to have been uttered in vain. We throw them off in the lust of battle and the rage of national antagonism as if religion, morality and civilisation was only a veneer spread lightly over the brute passions and animal instincts of the primeval savage. Do not in the name of humanity and of our higher knowledge and wider experience and our larger spiritual outlook, let us forget that truth is the goal for which we aim—our only safeguard to know the truth and do it. The present outbreak informs us that we are still far from the plane of our highest thought and noblest ideals, but they will conquer us in the end. The mill of God grinds slowly, but it grinds. Truth and righteousness will one day emerge triumphant!

“Their words shall not be brought to naught.”

J. PARKINSON.

ERRATA.—*Islamic Review*, Vol. II., No. 9 (October), page 462, fourth line from bottom of page—for “Gospel of Luke,” read “Gospel of John”; page 466, fifth line from top—for “Cults,” read “Cult.”—J. Parkinson.

ISLAM.

WHEN hearts made soft by love
Shall turn again to prayer,
There comes a heavenly solace
To those in dark despair.

With heartfelt prayer and patience
We reach that home of peace,
To dwell in Unity with God,
Whose love doth never cease.

Such is the Muslim's faith
In God, our bless'd Protector,
Our all-sufficient God of love,
Our Lord, our great Creator.

Woking.

MOBARIKAH ALICE WELCH.

THE QURAN AS A MIRACLE.

By The MAULVI MOHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B.

THE chief defect in all miracles attributed to the great founders of religious systems is the lack of evidence which would demonstrate the occurrence of the alleged events. Contemporaneous

records there are almost none, and thus whatever may have been the nature of the miracles wrought, and whatever may have been their effect at the time, they cannot carry conviction into the heart of an inquirer to-day. Yet if the only object of the performance of a miracle is to bring about a transformation in the lives of a people, the Holy Quran stands out as a unique miracle of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him !), for it was through the Quran, and the Quran alone, that he brought about that wonderful transformation in Arabia which compels even his most stringent critics to admit him as "the most successful" of all religious personalities.*

To have an idea of the miraculous transformation wrought by that greatest benefactor of humanity, the Holy Prophet that was born in the land of Hedjaz, it is necessary to cast a glance at the state of Arabia before and after his appearance. A complete revolution was brought about by the Holy Quran in less than a quarter of a century, not only in the religious beliefs of the people, but in the whole structure of Arabian society. Before the Prophet's advent the Arabs worshipped strange gods and paid divine honours to idols made of stone. They believed that none but their idols brought about rain and made the earth yield its produce, and that they had full control over all things pertaining to life and death. Every one of them believed himself to be under the patronage of a special deity, before whom he bowed down. To it he addressed his supplications and prayers in times of disaster, to it he looked up for all his needs, and to it he presented all his offerings. Idolatry, in fact, was so deep-rooted and had so perfectly baffled all attempts to sweep it off that the task was now quite hopeless.

Morally, the condition of the Arabs offered no better prospect of transformation. They freely indulged in adultery and theft, murdered the innocent and robbed the stranger, ate up the property of orphans, oppressed the poor and tyrannised over the weak, and committed all sorts of sin without fear of retribution. They were utter strangers to the dignity of human nature, and had not the least idea of the responsibility of human actions. The evil of drink was widespread, the constant warring of one tribe with another giving it a still greater impetus, and their victories against each other were celebrated by orgies. Infanticide was openly practised ; gambling was most common. Sir William Muir thus sums up the whole situation in pre-Islamite Arabia :—

"The prospects of Arabia before the rise of Muhammad were as unfavourable to religious reform as they were to political union or national regeneration. The foundation of Arab faith was a deep-rooted idolatry, which for centuries had

* Encyclopædia Britannica.

stood proof, with no palpable symptom of decay, against every attempt at evangelisation from Egypt and Syria."

And again :—

"During the youth of Muhammad the aspect of the peninsula was strongly conservative; perhaps *never at any previous time was reform more hopeless.*"

Christianity and Judaism had for centuries tried to convert the Arabs, and yet, in the words of the same author, the result was :—

"After five centuries of Christian evangelisation we can point but to a sprinkling here and there of Christian converts. Judaism, vastly more powerful, had exhibited spasmodic efforts at proselytism; but as an active and converting agent, the Jewish faith was no longer operative."

Sacred history does not show that any other prophet was ever confronted with such a hard, nay, almost impossible, task of reformation. And yet within an incredibly short time, a space of no more than twenty short years, Arabia was revolutionised. It was not a political revolution, raising a nation from the thralldom of subjugation to the coveted position of being a conquering and a ruling nation, though even politically the Prophet had performed the apparently impossible task of welding the jarring elements of tribes and families constantly at war with each other into a single nation, a nation endowed with life and vigour, and bearing the torch of knowledge and civilisation into the corners of the world. But it was the far more difficult task of changing the religious beliefs—beliefs imbibed into the very blood of a whole nation, of subverting all their social and ethical codes, of changing their ancient customs—nay, their very habits. Those who bowed before hewn and unhewn stones now became the proclaimers of Divine Unity. The believers in the most absurd superstitions became foremost in the search of knowledge. In the days of ignorance they were immersed in the depths of darkness; it was the Quran that gave them light and liberty. Their evil dispositions were changed for virtuous inclinations; their nocturnal orgies gave place to heartfelt prayers; infanticide had disappeared. Drunkenness, which has always baffled the attempts of the greatest reformers, and which is to-day the curse of civilised society, with all its pretensions of learning and advancement, was swept off at one word. Rights began to be respected, and the hatred of man for man gave place to loving sympathy and affectionate treatment. Not only were the poor no more oppressed, but a system was evolved in which they were made to have a share, subject to certain limits, in the property of the rich, and the strong and the weak were now on one level.

Indeed it was the Quran that first made the Arabs aware of the dignity of human nature and unravelled to them the

beauty and grandeur of man's soul. It was the salutary example of the Holy Prophet that brought about such a marvellous spiritual awakening. A whole nation arose from the depths of degradation and soared aloft until it reached the highest point of moral and spiritual perfection. And yet the Quran not only wrought this miracle of transformation in the Arabs, but its teachings have worked the same miracle over and over again among civilised nations equally with the savage or semi-civilised ones. Its teachings are graduated and can be marked off into three stages according to the different stages of a man's moral and spiritual development. The first stage comprehends rules calculated to lift up natural man from his savage and primitive state, and to supply him with rudiments of morals; the second stage consists of a sublime and perfect system of ethics fitted to elevate man to the height of perfection as a moral being; the third stage is meant to make the morally perfect man godly in the truest sense of the word. At this stage man loses himself wholly in God and resigns himself completely to His will. Here the demon of desire and lust is crushed to rise no more, and the turmoil of passions ceases once for all.

The glory belongs to the Holy Quran that it carries a man to the haven of perfect security, that high and sacred place where Satan is not allowed to set foot. Through this book man is raised to the highest point of perfection he is capable of. Thus it may be called a miracle of the Holy Prophet, *a miracle of knowledge as well as of power*. The miracles associated with the names of other prophets are stale and out of date; they remain confined only in books, and have no practical value whatever. But the Quran is a standing miracle for all times and all places. Its being a miracle of knowledge is attested to by the following facts :—

Firstly, the Quran comprehends all the necessary doctrines, precepts and directions which not only guide man safely through the journey of life, but also impart to him the most clear and certain knowledge respecting God, and shows him the surest and nearest way of seeing Him and holding communion with Him.

Secondly, the Quran advances the most convincing arguments in support of its truth, and we can draw upon its treasures of Divine wisdom.

The Quran is also a miracle of power. The wonderful spiritual influence exerted by the Holy Quran, and the marvellous transformation brought about by its teachings, have always puzzled philosophers. It has moved the hardest hearts, renewed the most perverted will, and regenerated the most depraved disposition.

EVEN POISONING OF MOHAMMAD ELICITED BUT FORGIVENESS.

‘Moreover, good and evil shall not be held equal. Turn away evil with what is better, and behold! he between whom and thyself was enmity shall be as though he were the warmest friend. But none attain to this perfection except they who are steadfast in patience, and none attain to it save the possessor of a very large heart.’—The Quran.

“Yet let the recompense of evil be only a like evil—but he who forgiveth and is reconciled shall be rewarded by God Himself; for He loveth not those who act unjustly. And there shall be no way open against those who, after being wronged, avenge themselves. But there shall be a way open against those who unjustly wrong others, and act insolently on the earth in disregard of justice. These! a grievous punishment doth await them. And whoso beareth wrongs with patience and forgiveth; this, verily, is the noblest and hardest task.”—The Quran.

MOHAMMAD stands out prominent in having successfully established the unity of Allah. It implies two most difficult operations: eradicating idolatry of long standing which had become part and parcel of the nature of the Arabs, and imparting instruction in the Oneness of God. The stronger the hold of a false doctrine on the hearts of a nation, the more vigorous and patient endeavours does it call for on the part of a reformer. The Apostle of Allah displayed a marvellously sympathetic and resolute heart in undertaking the correction of a nation which was passionately given to idolatry and superstition. His grim determination and untiring zeal for the extermination of the worship of fetishes called forth an equally violent and terrible opposition. Every tribe adored its own idol, and manifested vehement indignation in standing up for the vindication of its honour. The whole of Arabia made common cause and rose in war against the expositor of Islam, which signifies consummate obedience to Divine laws ingrained in our nature and codified in the Quran. The terribly hot opposition assumed the form of active operations, especially when the Arabian prophet had been pursued into Medina. He had to experience, indeed, a very rough time of it. The Quran sketches the doleful picture which necessitated struggle on the defensive:—

“Why should ye not fight on the path of Allah, and for the weak among men, women, and children? who say, ‘O, our Lord, bring us forth from this city whose inhabitants are oppressors; give us a champion from Thy presence; and give us from Thy presence a defender.’”

Invaded on all sides by the belligerents, he was constrained to take the field occasionally or to send out his men to meet aggressions. The chequered career of reverses and successes provided an excellent opportunity for manifesting the various phases of the character of the claimant. No trying circumstances, no ordeal, no violent opposition could keep him from working in the direction of the unity of Allah. When successful no recollection of atrocities inflicted on him and his was ever too strong for preventing him from meting out kindness and forgiveness to the vanquished foe. It is by the dint of his noble character and genuine sympathy that he cherished for mankind, and mercy that he showed to the enemy, that people crowded to Islam. Compulsion engenders hypocrisy, which has nothing in common with sincerity. The followers of Mohammad have always signalised themselves for their devotion to Mohammad and Islam. This speaks for the charm that the doctrines possess, and refutes the baseless charge that Islam was administered at the point of the sword.

The following episode occurred in the 7th year of Flight, when the concerted forces of the Jews and idolatrous Arabs were defeated at Khaibar, and the town fell. Merciful and magnanimous as he was, Mohammad extended general forgiveness, and assured the disbelievers of the safety of their life and property. He sojourned there for three days, and before quitting the place for Medina he fell a prey to a conspiracy.

The mercy and kindness that the humiliated inhabitants of the fallen city met with at the hands of the Prophet was requited in a very cruel and cowardly manner. They conspired to despatch him; they knew his virtues. He was very sociable, had no arrogance about him, and readily reposed confidence even in the vanquished foe. They contrived to beseech him to accept a gift of roasted mutton. The Prophet would not disappoint them. They felt overjoyed, and readily set to work to give effect to their shameless scheme. A fanatic was selected for the discharge of the task. Zainab, who boasted descent from a well-known warlike family of status, and whose uncle Marhab had suffered a very shocking defeat in the recent battle—Ali having cloven his skull with his heavy scimitar—was agreed upon as the right instrument. The exasperated lady, in whose bosom fanaticism was rivalling with thirst for wreaking vengeance, used her craft in charging the roasted mutton with the deadliest drug, concentrating it most in the shoulder, which she came to know the Prophet best cared for. The plot was almost successful, and the apostle was near falling a helpless victim to it. The viand was placed before him and his adherents. The object of prey partook a small quantity, and then spat it out, instinctively as it were. But Bashar, who had been demonstrating wonderful feats of strength and prowess in the field of hostilities, fell prostrate on the spot. A warrior, who was adamant against sword and spear, fell an easy prey to the guiles

of a vile wretch. His death-struggle was unbearable; he expired in the midst of writhes and convulsions. The treacherous treatment that was designed to extinguish the life of their divine leader, and that brought about the sudden and tragic death of one of the choicest flowers of Islam, made the camp indignant and furious beyond bounds. The scene can better be imagined than described. The enraged and victorious hosts demanded instant retaliation.

Ordinary commanders are carried away by the tide of strong feeling of their men. Nay, they seek pretexts for committing violence and pillaging the fallen folk. But Mohammad was pre-eminent in enjoying freedom from such diplomatic craft. He had already granted them quarter, and would be true to his word even at the cost of heavy price. He sent for the conspiritors and required them to state the entire plot. They were reluctant in disclosing the story and attempted in vain to throw Mohammad off the track. At last the culprit avowed the black deed she had perpetrated. Now think of the present war and wanton violence that has been incessantly practised on the slightest pretexts, and think of Mohammad, whose own life was threatened, who was victorious and in a position to inflict exemplary punishment on the miscreants, and who was pressed by his hosts to soundly chastise the ungrateful foe. What should he do now? Could he not consult convenience and quench his own anger, taking shelter behind the indignation of his furious hosts? Could he forgive without incurring the displeasure of his comrades, who were justified in vindicating vengeance for mean perfidy? Should he not avail himself of the opportunity that offered for threatening the town into Islam? Lord Mohammad was invincible to all such impulses. He was possessed of a remarkably strong but charitable character. He considered the question and forgave the offender. Even the hostile writers have had to record this memorable event, which is so eloquent of the various aspects of the noble heart of Lord Mohammad. Undoubtedly it argues an incredibly large patriarchal heart. To such irresistible and fascinating traits of the Apostle Islam owes its rapid spread and diffusion. The ignorant critic does not realise that this is a far sharper instrument than the sword to break the stiffness of disbelief.

Mohammad was not a man who would only theorise and talk of "humanity" and "forgiveness." In his life one studies everything practised, and his precept invariably coupled with his personal example presents a personality which is gloriously ideal. The Quran is justified in depicting him as an exemplary character:—

**"Verily a noble pattern had ye in Allah's apostle, for
all who hope in Allah and in the latter day and oft
remember Allah."**

DIVORCE,—EAST AND WEST.

MARRIAGE should be a great factor in human happiness. When two people feel for each other that overwhelming love that causes them to enter into a life contract, the result should be happiness in the highest degree. Why should it not be so, when God has so blessed mankind with such a system of harmony, when everything which has been created for us tends to our well-being and felicity?

There are occasions when, after all, two people find that they have made a great mistake, they are quite out of harmony with each other, and life together becomes intolerable; who shall deny that in such a case a dissolution of partnership becomes a vital necessity? We have here in the Occident a peculiar state of affairs: Christianity denies the right of divorce, while the State permits the same. Which of these two are right? Are these unfortunate people, who have erred in judgment in thus uniting their lives, to be condemned to an existence which is hell upon earth? If this state of things should come about, do we believe that the Merciful Creator demands that they should sacrifice themselves in this manner? Has the Church any justification for thus forbidding the annulment of the marriage? In every work of His we see peace, happiness, and harmony; every atom works in its own manner, but in such a way as to conduce to regularity and peace—all runs smoothly in accordance with His Will. How is it that discord arises? Simply through lack of judgment, want of understanding, or falling away from obedience to the Will of God.

Can we blame Him for any misery, immorality or lack of concord on this earth, when He has so ordered things that they work together in one harmonious whole, when by obedience to His commands we can all work together in complete unity? Is not the error, the fault, if you will, the result of our own incapacity? Therefore, when we make a mistake we should remedy it at once, and not allow one incident to follow another until absolute discord is the result. Let us take a musical instrument: every note there is in tune, and follows a natural sequence. If a player uses the proper notes harmonious melody results, but should he strike a wrong key through error or lack of understanding, a discord follows which offends the ear and produces an unpleasant sensation through our whole frame. The keys or cords of the instrument are the beautiful gifts from our Creator, everything blending, the players are we mortals; and if we utilise these gifts in the proper way love, happiness, and all that is beautiful is the sequence. But if we err or deliberately disobey by misusing these, then what follows is the

result of our own action, and we alone are to blame. How truly the Holy Quran says:—

“WHATEVER GOOD BEFALLETH THEE, O MAN,
IT IS FROM GOD; AND WHATSOEVER EVIL
BEFALLETH THEE, IT IS FROM THYSELF.”

Thus we can realise that if two persons enter the state of matrimony, and are knit together with that sacred love, and their actions, thoughts, and ideals blend together, they are in tune with the will of God, and so live in a state of complete happiness. On the other hand, if they find that they cannot work together, but are totally dissimilar in all their actions and ideals, that what to one is right is to the other wrong, thus living in a state of war with each other, it must become misery for them to be thus bound to each other for life. Here we should analyse the question as to whether God would favour this state of marital infelicity, or if it be in accordance with His will that the couple should disunite. The Christian Church has said “Whom God hath joined, let no man put asunder,” and we often hear of “marriages made in heaven,” but judging from the sordid details which we read every week in the newspapers one is inclined to think that many are made in a less inviting environment. Still we do find this, that in many things Europe does not follow the teachings of the Church, but is far more rational and enacts various laws which suit the requirements of the age. This proves that Christianity is neither suitable to all races, nor to all periods in the world’s history. We find that Christianity rather encourages the use of wine, thus making it necessary for the State to enact laws against drunkenness; also the Bible favours the holding of slaves, whilst the State has liberated them by legislation; the early Church was polygamous, the law of monogamy being enforced by the State. Recently the Church upheld that a man should not marry his deceased wife’s sister, but the State passed a Bill authorising this. Which must we follow—the Church or the State? If these laws are necessary, why has Christianity these things lacking? Would it do so if it were the religion of the universe? if it were intended by God to supersede all other creeds? This question of divorce is the same; the Church refuses to acknowledge its legality, whilst the State grants facilities for this purpose. By refusing to allow divorce Christianity has retarded the advancement of morality in the highest degree. People, unable to dissolve their unhappy existence, have lived apart, and immorality has been the result. The State has rendered it very difficult to obtain divorce for poor people, and thus has pandered to a certain degree to the Church. When a divorce case comes before the Courts all the sordid portions of the lives of the two people are reported in the journals, and are eagerly read and discussed by the general public; bitterness arises between the parties in the very Court; and after the public disgrace a recon-

ciliation is a virtual impossibility. Clever lawyers pick the character of each party to pieces, and thus they present a very sorry spectacle to the public eye. Again, the law is unfair to the woman. A man can obtain a divorce upon misconduct being proved, but a woman must also produce evidence of cruelty. How many a man can be guilty of making the life of his partner hell upon earth in many ways other than by striking her is often realised in the West, and the poor woman has no remedy unless misconduct and personal violence can be proved to the satisfaction of the Court. There are thousands and thousands of divorces in the Occident, which shows beyond doubt that the people are at least un-Christian in this respect. Often a cheap sneer is thrown at Islam, "Oh, yes; divorce is very easy." Do those people fully realise the full circumstances of a Muslim divorce? Do they realise the high respect which Muslims pay to their womenfolk? Do they realise the horror of any Muslim at the bare thought of his wife being dragged before a curious public and cross-examined until she faints under the ordeal? Oh, why do not these people see the beam in their own eye? The Muslim realises that his womenfolk must be protected against the world, and that she must be shielded from all those noxious weeds which canker the life of other nations. She is allowed perfect freedom within certain limits, her ways are restricted when it is conducive to her well-being, she is not "shut up in a harem," but is placed by the Muslim husband on a higher pedestal than the wives of other peoples. She is regarded as the gift of God, as a treasure to be guarded against those annoyances and troubles in the world which would cause her pain and sorrow. Therefore, the position of woman in a Muslim house is not that of a domestic slave, as alas! too often she is in Europe, but that of absolute mistress of the household. She has rights which she can use against her husband should he stand in need of correction, and a mother does the same to her sons. An incident in the life of Muhammad Ali, the all-powerful viceroy of Egypt, will serve to illustrate the respect for women amongst Muslims. He had offended his mother, and she places her shoes at the door of her apartments. He had come a long way to see her, but she was adamant, she would not remove the shoes, which was a sign of her displeasure; and although he was virtually king, yet, so strong is the respect for women in Muslims as ordered by Islam, he humbly remained days at her door until she relented. Thus a Muslim admonishes his wife, or she him, in the house. If they find that it is impossible to live together, then the divorce is quietly consummated. Which is the nobler course, that of the West or of the East? Islam allows divorce, but it is practically unknown in Muslim lands. Christianity refuses divorce, and the result in the morality of the West is the most fitting answer to the prohibition. No legislation is necessary in Islamic countries, for the religion has given regulations which guide

one's whole life, and thus we contend that the world would be nearer to the ideal, would be Utopia in very truth, if Islam became the religion of humanity.

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

DOES CHRIST ENDORSE THE CHRISTIAN MEANING OF FAITH?

PEOPLE are apt to look scoffingly at the man with a mission, but it is the men and the women with missions who have, in fact, made the world what it is to-day. "A crank," said some wit, "is a little thing that makes revolution." The saying is as true as it was in the time of Jesus Christ, that God has "Chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." If there is one word in our language more misunderstood than any other, it is the little word "faith."

THE MEANING OF FAITH.

We have been told by the cynic that faith is the capacity for believing that which we know to be untrue, and the misinterpretation of this term by the orthodox clergy is responsible for the derision which has been cast upon it. The worst of sinners within the fold of the Church has been the evangelical contingent: "Believe," they tell us, "all the dry-as-dust dogmas of orthodox theology, and you will win eternal salvation." This is not, we may be sure, the sense in which Jesus used the word. Neither is it the sense in which, in a magnificently eloquent passage, the word was employed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews when he spoke of those who, through faith, subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of the Aliens.

The faith of Jesus and the faith of his apostles and followers is the faith that implies and includes the power to achieve. It is what we call in the ordinary language of the day "self-confidence," but it is not the confidence in the lower, but the higher self; it is the confidence which comes of the conscious placing of ourselves *en rapport* with what Prentice Mulford called "the Infinite Life" and the "Divine Source." This power is the secret of all great achievement.

The FAITH of the orthodox, on the other hand, corresponds to the CREDULITY of the man in the street. It is the will-o'-the-wisp that leads fools to sacrifice the reality for a chimera. It was in condemnation and in ridicule of such folly as this that Omar

Khayyām bade his friends “take the cash and let credit go.” It was this spirit of faith that enabled great men to carry it at length to a triumphant conclusion—successful in spite of those imperfections inevitably incidental to onerous duties achieved under the defective conditions of humanity.

RALPH SHIRLEY.

LA MUSLIMA GRAVA PREGO.

CIUJ laudoj estu ce Allah (Dio) Kiu estas (Arabe: Rabbul-Aálameen) la kreinto kaj subtenanto de la tutaj universoj; Kiu (Rahman) donacas al ni benadojn; por havigi kiujn al ni, ni mem faris nenion, kaj donas al ni ciujn necesojn, ec antaŭ ol ni komencis pensi por ili. Kiu (Raheem) rekompencas nin multfoje: Kiu pripensas niajn agojn, Li estas Rego de la tago de la jugo.

Vin sole ni adoras, de Vi sole ni petas helpon.

Gvidu nin, O Allaho en la vojo Kiu kondukas rekte al Vi.

Gvidu nin ke ni sekvu tiujn vi benadis.

Savu nin de la vojo de tiuj kiuj malgrau scio forlasas la veran gvidon, kaj kiuj per tio malhelpis sin.

Savu nin ankau O Allaho de tiuj kiuj eraras kaj ne trovas Vin.

Amen.

Tiuj strofoj estas la unuaj en la “Libro de Dio.” Muslimoj elparolas ilin kelkajn fojojn en la kvin tagajpregoj. Kiel nobligantaj kaj plenaj de energio ili estas; kiun fortecon ili donas, kian vidajon ili malfermas, kian spiriton de nedependeco kaj libereco; kian progreson, kian eviton kontraŭ la kolero de Dio. Kaj kiel ili montras la pravan celon!

Autau la alveno de Islam la ideo ekzistis ke nur per sango oni povus akiri pardonon de Dio, kaj la popoloj de Grekuj Hinduoj kaj Romo mortigis homojn kaj bestojn. La Israelidoj ofte kontraŭbatalis popolojn kiuj ofendis la Dion de Israelo. Vilagoj bruligis, kaj bestoj, viroj, virinoj, infanoj devis morti por placi al la terura Jehova. Tiu speciala eco de kompato, kiun ni trovas en la prediko de Sta Paulo ne povis akiri meriton sen la sango de Jesus. Unu Kiu kondamnis la tutan rason pro la peko de unu viro, Kiu ne akceptas bonajn farojn sen ia speciala fido ne estas amanta nek aminda Dio. Tuij ci doktrinoj ne estas indaj de siaj fabrikintoj, donas neniom da gloro al Dio, kaj ne estis la predikadoj de Jesuo Kristo. Ili estas tute kontraŭ la senlima kompateco kiun la Rego de la Mondo montris kiam li kreis cion por ni antaŭ ol ni ekzistis, sed Kiu estas tiel necesa por ni kaj li faris tion ci sen ia bonfaro au merito de la homaro. Unu Kiu tiel kompatas, kaj sen merito ce nia flanko, cu li ne povus pardoni niajn pekojn sen la verso de sango?

La tri unuaj ecoj kuĵn ni legas supre en la preĝo malfermu okulojn por la klara vido al nia Kreinto, nia Subtenanta kaj Fruktiganto, la Dio de Amo, Kompato, de senfinaj benadoj, Kiu kreis cion por servi al ni sen ia merito ce ni. Tiu ĉi estas la ideo kiun la vorto "Rahman" enhavas, kaj Kiu estas malprave tradukita "Plej Kompatema" en ĉioj Anglaj tradudaĵoj de la Kurano.

Li estas "Raheem" kiu donas mil kaj unu benadojn al homoj por ilij bonaj agoj, ne pro in speciala kredo.

La kvara eco estas tre instruema, "Malike yaumiddeen," La Rego de la tago de la jugo. Li donos meriton por ĉiu bona ago, kaj estas en Lia povo pardoni au puni malbonuloj. Li estas Rego kaj pro tio povas puni au pardoni laŭ Sia volo.

Tiu ĉi eco en la unua ĉapitro el la Sankta Kurano estis inspirita por montri la verajn karakterecojn de Dio, kaj eligi el la menso ĉiujn ideojn kiuj antaŭe ekzistis, ĉar ili kreis malbonajn doktrinojn.

Tiam venas la proksiman version :—

"Vin sole ni adoras O Dio kaj de Vi ni petas helpon."

Kia spirito de libereco. Vi ne devas al rigardi ion homon por helpo. Ni ne devas alprokoimigi al iu krom Dio, ĉar aliaj homoj estas egalaj al ni. Ni ĉiuj havas egalan rajton. La mondo kaj la benadoj de Dio estas por la homaro. Se iu atingis grandan rangon, tio ne estas pro speciala favoro de Dio, sen ni mem povas atingi la samon. Kio estas ebla por unu estas ebla por ĉiuj.

La ideo, la Uneco de Dio montras la egalecon de homoj. Li ne estas "Jaluza Dio" ni ne havas tiun ĉi ideon en nia Sankta Libro, sed ĝi montras ke la tuta universo estas au egala al ni au servas al ni. De longa tempo ĝis nun la homaro adoris la Naturon, stonojn, arbojn kelkajn diojn, kaj la homon mem. Ili bezonis klarigon, kaj la uneco de Dio estis la ilo. Je tiu tempo ili kun unu paso eksciis ke la aliaj dioj estis nur viroj au io kio ne egalas ĉe ili. Iu kiu postulas de homoj adoradon Kiu mortigas egalecon volas farigi Dio kaj Muslimoj ne povas ĝin akcepti. Tiu ĉi idealo nomu ĝin "Unueco de Dio" au egaleco de homo kreas ĉiujn ideojn demokrateco, socialismo, kaj universaj frateco. Ĝi sole povas doni al ni paradizon sur tero. La sekvanta strofo energiigas nin. Ni petas Dian gvidon por lerni la

VOJO DE LA BENATULOJ.

Ni deziras scil kiel ni povas sekvi la leĝojn de Dio kaj ricevi Lian benon. Ĉu vi povus imagi ion plu altan plu noblan, ion plu dezisindan kaj posesindan ol tio, kiun ni kompenas en la granda skopo de la vortoj "Dia Beno." La verso malfermas al ni cion kio estas inda. Dio mem instruas nin preĝi tiamaniere, kaj ĉu Li ne donos. Lian farovon se ni sekvos la pravan vojon! La fak to ke tiu ĉi preĝo estas Dio ordono montras Lian volon por doni al ni cion kion oni povus imagi—artojn,

sciencan, civilacion, trezoron, povon, spiritan purecon, bonecon, kaj alta spiritecon—ion kio estas dezirinda.

Nia grava Prego montras al ni la vojon kiu iras rekte por nia plibonigo, kaj igas nin inda ricevi la benojn de Dio.

Dio kreis la tutan universon por la evolucio de la homaro. Ni petas Lian Kompaton por helpi nin efektiviĝi tuin ci ideon. Ni alvoku Lin "Rahman" kaj "Raheem." Ecoj kiuj montras du specojn de kompato: Unu malkovras sin en la kreo de aĵoj tiel necesa por nia vivo kaj progreso, la alia venas por fruktigi niajn agojn. La unua kreis aĵojn kiujn ni ne povis, sed kiun ni bezonas kiel materialon por nia subteno; la lasta igas niajn laborojn sukcesplena, kiam la materialo estas uzata. La funkcio de unu finigas kie la alia komencigas. Ĉu kreitajaro ne montras tiujn du ecojn tiel bone metitajn en la Musliman Pregon? La universo kaj ĉio en ĝi, la atmosfero, la suno, la luno, la steloj, fakte ĉio estas la laboro de Dio por nia helpo, nia plibonigo, por servi al ni, sed ili faros por ni nenion se ni ne helpas nin mem. La scienculo ne kreas, li uzas materialon ĵan kreita, la terkulturisto semas kaj ĉion plu estas donita al li de Dio. Tiu ĉi granda leciono estas en la menso kelktempe tage dum niaj kvin pregoj. Ili memorigas nin pri Dio, kiu estas "Rahman" kaj "Raheem." Lia boneco estas senfina sed ĝi ne utilas se ni ne uzas Lian donacon. Kiel "Rahman" Li Kompatas egale ĉiujn, Kiel "Raheem" Li rekompensas tiujn kiuj faras ion si mem. Pripensu la ordon de la du eldiroj "Vin ni adoras, kaj de Vi ne petas helpon." Unue "adori" kaj tiam "helpi." Helpe venas al tiuj kiuj adoras unue kaj memoru la vorton "Ibadat" kiu enhavas la ideon de adorado, sed ankanke ni devas uzi en la plej bona maniero la donacojn de Dio.

Denove pripensu la vortojn "de Vi ni petu helpon." Ni ne petas ke Dio faru ion for ni mem, ni simple petas Lian helpon. En tiuj ĉi vortoj ni konsentas ke ni estas faranta ĉion en la povo, kaj nun ni petas Lian helpon. Tiel

"Dio helpas tuijn kiuj helpas sin mem" estos
Islama ideo.

La sekvanta verso klarigos la specon de la helpo kiun ni bezonas.

"Gvidu nin en la vojo de la benatuloj."

Ni petos ke Li helpu nin ke ni sekvu tuijn kiuj iras prave: Estas multaj vojoj, longa, mallonga rekta, malrekta, granda, malgranda. Ni petas ke Li montru la pravan vojon.

* * * * *

En tiu ĉi Prego estas.

Granda Morala Lekcio por Muslimoj kaj aliaj popoloj. Estas la sekreto de sukceso Tiu ĉi estos la vojo, marsu humile laŭ la volo de Dio kaj ni ricevos Lian benon. Frapu je la pordon kaj ĝi malfermiĝos al vi. La frapo estas via ago—la malfermo la laboro de Dio: sed la movo devas veni de vi.

والمعصاة من قلوب الوري وادعوهم الى سبيل الهدى مهج
 الحق والولا حتى يكتشف هذا السحاب الكثيف عن افق
 ساطع لامع بنور التقديس فالليل والنخل مستغرق اليوم في
 لجة العي متقاتلة مسئلة السيوف مصوبة النهام الى الصدور
 والنخورد وهذه الظلمات الصليم الذهب ليس لها كاشف الا
 نور الحقيقة والذات الالهى والهاتف المكنون حتى تدنور
 القلوب بنور الهدى وتقرأ العين بمشاهدة الايات الكبرى
 فتلك القوة الالهية خارقة للعادات فاصحة للذو وهام فاصحة
 لتفانيد العوام فعليك بها وعليك بها وعليك بها
 ٢٠٠ رمضان ١٢٣٢ عمار الهادي

عن جعفر بن زر الهادي

للشبهات وادلة قطعية عينية لا يكاد احد ينكرها سواء
 كان من الفلاسفة والقسوس او الراسخون في الصغيات
 وبما اتى اطلعت من مضمون خطابكم الكريم انه ورد اناس
 على الورد المورود واخذوا صيداً من الرشد المورود اشرح
 صدرى كائننى فى سماع من مزامير ال داور فبالها الفاصل
 الودود اسئل الله ان يؤيدك فى اثبات الحق حتى تتأصل
 التقاليد العتيقة كالعظام الرهينة من القلوب والنفوس
 تظهر الحقيقة الساطعة الانوارى خير الشهود وتخرج
 عن النفوس الثياب الرثيث وتقمص بقميص التقديس
 حيث الالم يخوضون اليوم فى مجار الاوهام ويستغرقون
 فى غمار ظنون ما ازل الله بها من سلطان ان ثمت اتصا
 الملة البيضاء والطريقة السنية النورا فعليك بارالة الشفاء

من طرف بعض التعصبين فلاجل ذلك دخلت المحافل العظمى
 حتى الكائن الكبرى واقمت البراهين القاطعة والحجج اللا
 والدلائل الساطعة من العقول والمنقول على نبوته عليه السلام
 وبنت بيانا شافيا كافيا ان تلك المفتريات ليست الا
 خزعبلات وخرافات فنبوة سيد الوجود مشورت مشهور
 ظهور الشمس في كبد السماء ولكن بما غشت القلوب بالاصا
 غشاة الثقليد والاستكبار غفلت النفوس وزهلت العقول
 عن ادراك هذه الاسرار واندرجت هذه الخطب في بطون
 الصنائف والاوراق والجرائد المهمة في تلك الديار حتى دخلت
 يوما الى المعابد الكبرى من اليهود واثبت بحضور الجمهور ان
 المسيح عليه السلام هو كلمة الله وسيد الوجود صلوات الله عليه
 جيب الله ببرهان خارق للا وهام كاشف للغشا وانفع

مسلم انديا

حضرة البارع الصاعد الفاضل الكامل جناب الشيخ كمال الدين منى بحجة

هو الله

ايها الفاضل الجليل والعالم النبيل
 اني لا زلت اذكريك بالايام المباركة التي اجتمعتكم في باب
 العذرة القصوى المدينة الكبرى وارتتم بذكرها في هذه
 البقعة البيضاء ولا انساها ابدا واسئل الله ان يقدركم
 اللقاء ولو بعدت الدار وتناثرت الزروع والاوطان لقد
 خطوت بمطالعة المقالات من حضرة اللورد الكريم هدى
 واضرحت صدري بتلاوة كتابكم المرسول الى الفاضل السيد
 هبة الدين في الخف الاشرف حيث دل بذكلكم الهمة العلية
 في ترويج الدين البين وابشأت بنوت سيد المرسلين عليه
 التحية والسلام وصلوات الله عليه وعلى اله الطيبين الطاهرين
 واني لما كنت اجول في اقاليم الغرب التاسعة الارضاء سمع
 زخرف القول بحق سيد المرسلين مروية في الصحاف المؤلفة